

AMERICA

A · CATHOLIC · REVIEW · OF · THE · WEEK

VOL. XLII, No. 17
WHOLE No. 1062

February 1, 1930

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

| | PAGES |
|---|---------------|
| CHRONICLE | 393-396 |
| EDITORIAL | |
| Sex in the School—Squandering City Money | |
| —The Rights of the Church in Education— | |
| Tears of the <i>Times</i> —Federal Centralization | |
| —The Criminal Telephone..... | 397-399 |
| TOPICS OF INTEREST | |
| Modernity in Literature — Obituary — Does | |
| Latin America Love Us?—Old Simeon Styl- | |
| ites—If You Go Abroad..... | 400-407 |
| SOCIOLOGY | |
| Sincerity in Law Enforcement..... | 408-409 |
| EDUCATION | |
| Rights of the State in Education..... | 409-410 |
| POETRY | |
| Song on the Hill—The Exacting Guest—As | |
| One Who Visits Rome..... | 402; 404; 407 |
| WITH SCRIP AND STAFF | 410-411 |
| LITERATURE | |
| Three Principles for Novels..... | 412-413 |
| REVIEWS | 413-415 |
| COMMUNICATIONS | 416 |

Chronicle

Home News.—Prohibition continued to occupy the attention of the legislative branch of the Government. On January 18, the small number of anti-Prohibition Representatives were snowed under in a series of attempts to modify the present laws: an effort to change the method of denaturing industrial alcohol, a proposal to vote \$300,000,000 to enforce the Volstead Act, and one to prevent the employment as Prohibition agents of persons under indictment or convicted of a felony, while the Prohibition majority adopted without a record vote an appropriation of \$15,000,000 for the Prohibition unit and \$15,000 for Government "dry" propaganda. Two bills were then introduced to put into practice the Wickersham preliminary report: one to amend the Jones Act by reducing to misdemeanors "slight and casual violations," and one to empower U. S. Commissioners to conduct trials in such cases.

Extreme hesitation and several contradictions marked what were apparently semi-official statements from the White House on the question of abolition of the battleship.

Washington on Arms Reduction

Following Premier MacDonald's proposal to scrap battleships, reporters with the American Delegation, still at sea, announced that it was utterly unacceptable. The following

day, apparently with White House approval, it was said that this country would go as far in the line of abolition of the battleship as would Great Britain. The following day the dispatches contained a severe reprimand for "irresponsible journalists" who represented this Government as in any way in favor of abolition of the battleship, which was considered an essential arm for the United States. The same dispatches announced that the United States, however, would be willing to consider a reduction in battleships. This was later modified to mean that we would discuss with Great Britain the addition of five years to the life of a battleship before it was declared obsolete. What was behind this hesitation was not revealed at the time.

The President's demand for the appointment by Congress of a commission of inquiry in Hayti was rejected by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. During the debate on the subject, Senator Blaine characterized the American administration of that republic as a "carpet-bagger regime." There was considerable difference of opinion as to the necessity of such an investigation, some holding that everything necessary is known, while Senator Borah thought an investigation might lead to early withdrawal of the United States. A proposal to appropriate \$50,000 for the President's use if he wished to appoint a commission himself was also blocked by Senator Blaine.

Austria.—Msgr. Ignaz Seipel, former Chancellor, recently proposed a constitutional change which would call for three houses of Parliament. A council of corporations, composed of representatives from all the professions, and to be called

Triple Parliament Proposed

Ständerat, would, together with the present *Nationalrat* or lower house, be placed under a Cabinet council, enlarged by the addition of provincial governors. Political and cultural problems would be dealt with by the *Nationalrat* and economic and financial issues would be settled by the *Ständerat*. All laws would have to pass all three chambers. The Socialists, of course, bitterly opposed the plan. Other parties appointed subcommittees to study the plan.—Delegates of the different farmers' organizations at a meeting in Vienna issued a manifesto announcing the creation of a new private army to be known as the *Bauerwehr*. The new move was supported by the Peasant party but condemned by the Christian Social party.

China.—Appalling reports continued to come from the famine districts, with no likelihood that effective help

would be afforded the sufferers because of the lack of transportation facilities. Anxiety was expressed, also, particularly for the missions and missionaries because of the continued bandit attacks. On the other hand, great friendliness seemed to prevail between the Nanking Government officials and the Church authorities. New evidence of the former's good will was recently given, according to a Fides News Service report, when the Government ordered 5,000 copies of "Le Triple Demisme de Suen Wen," by the Rev. Pasquale d'Elia, S.J., a critical translation into French of the famous work of Sun Yat Sen, the "Father of the Chinese Republic," in which he sets forth his three principles. Originally Father d'Elia had sent a copy of his book to the Ministers of Public Instruction and of Foreign Affairs and it was their commendations that called forth the Government's order. The book, which was published at Zi-ka-wei, the great Jesuit center near Shanghai, is extremely important for Chinese Catholics in so far as it makes clear what their position should be on many delicate and debated questions regarding Suen Wen's doctrines. Simultaneously with the order for Father d'Elia's book, the Synodal Commission under the leadership of His Excellency the Most Rev. Celso Costantini, Apostolic Delegate to China, announced the publication of a sixty-six page pamphlet on "The Three Principles and the Catholic Religion," by Father Martin, C.S. The booklet has parallel French and Chinese texts and gives the Catholic teaching on the various points treated in Sun Yat Sen's three principles. An introductory chapter deals with the great leader and his religion.

Colombia.—On January 21, the American Minister, Jefferson Caffery, arrived in Bogota. His presence, incidentally, gave a new color to the political campaign, as in an interview with the press he paid tribute to the diplomatic record of Dr. Olaya, Minister to Washington, who is campaigning for the Presidency on a platform independent of party affiliations. Though a Liberal, it will be recalled that Dr. Olaya has represented the Conservative Government in Washington for seven years. According to an announcement in *El Expectador*, on January 22, Dr. Olaya formally registered as a candidate for the February elections. To offset this move and consolidate the Conservative candidacy, General Vasquez Cobo announced his withdrawal as a candidate on the split Conservative ticket. He asked his followers to elect Senor Valencia. It was understood that Archbishop Perdomo, who had been favoring Cobo's candidacy, would transfer his support to Valencia.

Germany.—The representatives of the Government departments, Federal States and medical and sociological authorities attended a conference in Berlin to discuss the declining birth rate. Dr. Carl Severing, Minister of the Interior, presided over the meeting, and Prof. Alfred Grotjahn, specialist in social hygienics at Berlin University; Prof. Rott, of the Berlin organization for the protection of in-

phants; and Prof. Hugo Sellheim of the Woman's Infirmary, Leipzig University, lectured on various subjects connected with the problem. Three committees were formed for an investigation and study of the "protection of motherhood, of the mortality of infants, and of vital statistics." A report was expected within three months, at which time the general conference might bring the issues before Parliament.—Dr. Jacob Gould Schurman, retiring American Ambassador, after presenting his letters of recall to President von Hindenburg, was guest of honor at a farewell luncheon given by the President. The retiring envoy was praised for his official activities in Berlin and for the promotion of friendly relations between the American and the German peoples. Dr. Schurman personally presented to the president of the German Red Cross a check for \$5,000, from the American Red Cross, to be used for relief work among Russian refugees of German extraction who are awaiting transportation to Brazil.

Great Britain.—The first protest by the Labor Government, against the spreading of Communist propaganda, made since the exchange of Ambassadors between Great Britain and the Soviets, was based on a message from the Third International, printed in the *Daily Worker*, the official organ of the Communist party of Great Britain. The message accused the Labor Government of "anti-Soviet intrigues, colonial brutalities and preparations for another imperialistic war." Arthur Henderson, the Foreign Secretary, stated in the House of Commons that his Government pointed out to the Soviet Ambassador that such messages were calculated to imperil relations between the two countries. Commenting on the protest to the Soviet representative, the *Daily Worker* found it a "first step" towards Great Britain breaking off diplomatic relations. Mr. Henderson, on the contrary, declared that it was not proposed to take further measures in this instance. He was understood to mean, however, that the British Government would hold the Soviets responsible for propaganda issued by the Third International.

Unemployment remained the most pressing problem before Parliament at its assembly after the Christmas recess. The latest statistics of the past month showed no improvement over the conditions of last year, despite the promises of the Labor Government and the active policy pursued. Registered unemployment increased during recent months. An even greater increase in the number of registrations of the unemployed was expected to follow the passage of the Unemployment Insurance bill. This would not be due to an actual increase in the amount of unemployment, but would indicate the increase of those who could receive benefits under the new law. The House of Lords passed several amendments revising and restricting the Unemployment Insurance bill. Similar action was taken by the Upper House on the Government measures regarding the coal industry. The small Government representation in the House of Lords was brought up to sixteen by accessions through recent creations.

The Government and Catholicism

Campaign

Birth Decline

Protest to Soviet

Unemployment

Guatemala.—Much interest centered in the Conference initiated in Washington, on January 20, to effect a settlement of the long existing Guatemalan-Honduran boundary question. The Government of the United

**Honduran
Conference**

States, it will be recalled, has for several years been exercising its good offices, at the request of both parties to the controversy, in an effort to find a basis upon which such a settlement could be effected. The personnel of the Guatemala delegation includes Carlos Salazar and Eugenio Silva Peña. Mariano Vasquez is representing Honduras in the discussions. In the opening session of the Conference the utmost cordiality between the delegates was manifested and both emphasized their desire to agree upon a just frontier. Unfortunately, the Conference had hardly opened when there was a report from Honduras that military movements on the Guatemalan border threatened to bring it to an end. A statement issued by the Honduran Foreign Minister disclosed that a detachment of Guatemalan forces had occupied Lancetillal and the Honduran military garrison there had been compelled to evacuate before the numerical superiority of the invaders. President Colindres, though he mobilized his troops to dislodge the Guatemalans, protested to the American Legation that until the invaders evacuated Honduran territory the boundary conference would not go on. After some parleying the American Minister informed the Foreign Office that the territory had been evacuated, and with the *status quo ante* restored the discussions were resumed.

Ireland.—According to a message from Dr. T. A. McLaughlin, managing director of the Electricity Supply Board, "1930 will see the Shannon hydro-electric power scheme in full operation." Construc-

**The Shannon
Scheme**

tional work had been finished on the Shannon River, but the work on distribution was continuing. Dr. McLaughlin stated that "an electrical consciousness is being developed among the people more rapidly than I expected, and electrical appliances are finding a ready market." He noted the fact, as particularly gratifying, of the manner in which people in the country towns and villages were utilizing the available supply of Shannon current for lighting houses and shops and for household purposes. The past year established a new record for electricity consumption in the cities, particularly in Dublin, where the rate of increase was more than fifty per cent over the year 1928.

Mexico.—President-elect Ortiz Rubio arrived in Mexico City after cutting short his trip in the United States. He was received by many adherents and made a speech in which he significantly alluded to ex-President Calles as Mexico's greatest

**Return of
Ortiz Rubio**

man. The President-elect found himself with grave questions on his hands. The first was the appointment of his Cabinet, not to be announced until his inauguration, February 5. The disputed positions were those of the Secretary of Finance and the Secretary of War. Montes de Oca, present Secretary of Finance, was understood to be looked upon favorably by the United

States because of the severe course of economy to which he had subjected the Portes Gil administration. Informed observers, however, considered that he would be displaced by former Secretary Pani, who negotiated the 1923 agreement with Thomas W. Lamont. There was apparently a disposition to displace General Amaro, Secretary of War, by some other general. Amaro's power with the army, however, was thought to be too strong to allow him to be set aside without serious trouble. Another problem facing the President was the split in his own party due to the expulsion from it of his own personal adherents on the permanent congressional committee.

As a result of Communist demonstrations against Ortiz Rubio in the United States, and of riots before Mexican embassies in Washington and elsewhere, the Government asked for the recall of the Soviet Ambassador and ordered the Mexican Minister at Moscow to withdraw to Spain. For the past several weeks, Mexico had been deporting Bolshevik organizers from the country.

**Break
With
Moscow**

Paraguay.—On January 19, the Minister of War issued a statement that a Bolivian patrol had attacked a Paraguayan encampment on the international border and that a Paraguayan soldier had been killed.

**Bolivian
Relations**

The announcement was met, however, by a denial on the following day from the Bolivian Foreign Office that its nationals had been responsible for any violation of order. Both countries seemed anxious to make it apparent that they were not putting obstacles in the way of the negotiations set on foot by the Uruguayan Government for settling the Chaco dispute. On January 22, Paraguay officially notified the League of Nations of the clash, and its filing of this "information" was interpreted in League circles as an evidence that the Council's intervention over the Chaco region was effective.

Portugal.—Following the resignation of the Ferraz Cabinet, the President invited Colonel Passos Souza to form a Government, but after four days the latter reported failure. Thereupon General Domingos Oliveira was called on January 20, and on the following day presented his list of Ministers to the President as follows: Foreign Relations, Fernando Branco; Interior, Lopez Mateus; Finance (and Colonies *pro tem.*), Antonio de Oliveira Salazar; Justice, Lopez Fonseca; War, Namorada Aguiar; Agriculture, Linhares Lima; Education, Gustavo Ramos; Commerce, Anibal de Mesquita Guimaraes; Marine, Magalhaes Correa. The new Premier announced that he would follow the policies of his predecessor.

**General
Oliveira
New Premier**

Spain.—The Premier followed his declaration of early retirement from power, made at the beginning of the year, with a long letter to the Patriotic Union, given to the press on January 18, wherein he urged preparation for the political campaigns of the summer by immediate organization of the necessary committees within the party. He

**Campaign
Plans**

offered to contribute the sum of 25,000 pesetas for campaign expenses. He reviewed the achievements of his regime, noting specially the pacification of Morocco, the restoration of order and national unity, the balancing of the budget, and the increased prestige of Spain abroad.

The recent decline in the peseta, attributed in several statements to the speculation of foreign groups and political opponents, caused sharp criticism of the Government's financial policy by Spanish industrialists, and finally resulted in the resignation of Finance Minister José Calvo Sotelo on January 21. The Count de Los Andos, former Minister of National Economy, accepted the Finance portfolio. It was predicted that the new Finance Minister would win better cooperation from the banks than did his predecessor.

Disarmament.—The Naval Conference was opened in the Royal Gallery of the House of Lords, in London, on January 21. Addresses were made by King George V, who spoke for the first time in public since his illness, and by the other chiefs of delegations: Messrs. MacDonald, Stimson, Tardieu, Grandi, Wakatsuki, and the representatives of the British Dominions. The addresses, including the King's speech, were re-broadcast around the world.

Conference Opens

The real work of the conference began on January 23. The utmost caution was agreed upon by all the delegates, who decided to avoid all public pronouncements on controversial points in the early stages of the parley. Extreme activity prevailed in the field of private conferences. The

issues which appeared to call for most immediate consideration were those of battleships and the Mediterranean. The British press received favorably Premier MacDonald's suggestions for drastic reductions in size and replacement of battleships. From Washington reports were issued that the United States could not consent to such; but could only favor a moderate reduction in tonnage, say to 28,500 tons. In comparing our eighteen battleships with the sixteen battleships and four battle cruisers of Great Britain, it was noted that four of our battleships would be obsolete before any of the British. British merchant cruisers would grow in importance with battleship reduction. Italy was said to agree with France in asking for a security addition to the Kellogg Pact, and to favor the previous working out of a Mediterranean agreement, preceded in its turn by an Italo-French understanding as to disputed points. Japan showed no signs of altering her stand. The French nationalist press continued its skepticism.

League of Nations.—American vigor in enforcing the anti-narcotic laws was praised when, on January 21, the United States report on the drug situation was read before the Opium Advisory Committee of the League. L. A. Lyall, British chairman of the Opium Central Board, called the committee's attention to the fact that 8,810 years, 10 months and 32 days total sentences and \$255,927 in fines

were imposed on traffickers in the United States for 1928, as compared with fines of "ten cents" imposed in the Dutch West Indies.

Reparations Question.—The final protocol of the Young plan was signed by eighteen nations at the Hague on January 20, in the chamber of the Netherlands States General in the historic Binnenhof. Czechoslovakia alone made verbal reservations, announcing her refusal to renounce her rights under the Treaty of Versailles. Five separate treaties were included in the settlement, with Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, Hungary and Czechoslovakia concerning reparations and one with Switzerland defining her relations with the Bank of International Settlements, the principal instrument created by the protocol. Only the preamble was made public. M. Jaspar, the Chairman, Premier of Belgium, and Philip Snowden were the only speakers, the latter remarking: "The nations gathered around the conference table by their act of signature are no longer enemies and allies, but from now forward must be friends." It was reported that a violent conflict took place during the deliberations between Mr. Snowden and the Czechoslovak delegates, who objected to the Eastern European accord.

The main features in the agreement with Germany are the decision on sanctions, which left the question of Germany's failure to pay to the World Court, and the accord on mobilization of reparations. The agreement with Hungary fixed only the general principles of the Eastern European accord, and referred the final text to a drafting committee. It provided for the settlement of the agrarian disputes by reference to the mixed tribunals with two additional judges to be named by the Hague Court. A liquidation fund of 240,000,000 crowns (\$48,000,000) was arranged for, which would be composed of payments by the Little Entente Powers, Hungary, and Britain, France and Italy. Hungarian Socialists expressed dissatisfaction in the Hungarian press. Austria was let off with a total of approximately 23,000,000 crowns, beginning in 1943.

Germany and Hungary

Some weeks ago John Wiltbye made an appeal to be furnished with a list of Catholic boarding schools for little boys. This list, as nearly complete as possible, will be published by him next week.

The opening of the third decade in this century prompted Martin P. Harney, a Professor of History, to recall the stirring events which have occurred in the 'thirties of other centuries. The result will appear next week in "The Thirties in History."

"Have You a Little Bolshevik in Your Home?" is the startling question asked by Eugene Weare. He has been investigating Communist activity among young folk.

Opium Report

AMERICA

A - CATHOLIC - REVIEW - OF - THE - WEEK

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1930

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRID PARSONS
Editor-in-Chief
PAUL L. BLAKELY FRANCIS X. TALBOT WILLIAM I. LONERGAN
JOHN LAFARGE CHARLES L. DOYLE JAMES A. GREELEY
Associate Editors
FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:

Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: Medallion 3082

Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Sex in the School

WE often sympathize with the American Association of University Professors. But we are not able to share the indignation of one of its committees over the dismissal last year of a professor and an assistant by the University of Missouri. In the name of what these gentlemen deemed science and research, several questionnaires on problems of sex conduct were circulated among the young men and women at the University.

It seems to us that the Association's committee words its protest in the spirit of the cock who thought that the sun rose to hear him crow, and in the style of the three tailors of Tooley Street. "Instructors in the University and citizens in general have the right to expect from the University administration clear and courageous leadership in the defense of the freedom of teaching and research," they tell us. True enough; but freedom of teaching and of research must be balanced, as must every activity in a college and everywhere else, by intelligence, common sense, and common decency. An inspection of the questionnaire, even in the form in which the public press ventured to present it, convinces us, as it convinced the University officials, that its authors were sadly deficient in all three qualities.

From the scientific viewpoint, we are unable to envision the loss consequent upon the suppression of some two hundred unsigned and unverified answers to questions which, it must be admitted, left few fields of sexual irregularities untouched. We have far too much of this sensational Sunday-supplement "Science." The value of tested and re-checked laboratory data is readily admitted, but it is difficult to see any worth in a series of unsigned papers, detailing real or imaginary youthful indiscretions, or outlining plans of conduct in face of situations to be encountered at some vague future time. Further, the teacher trained in psychology, can understand that the composition of these real or fictitious confessions may occasion considerable harm to the student.

Not even the elementary schools, it would seem, are

free from these offensive questionnaires. Last week the mothers and fathers in South Norwalk, Conn., discovered that their small children were being required to answer a number of questions touching upon matters which only an idiot or a man of depraved character would dare suggest to a child. In this case, the idiot was a teacher at Yale University.

It is not easy to appeal to Catholic parents who deliberately and definitely entrust their children to the public schools without the Bishop's permission, when there is provision in a Catholic school. Still, we are convinced that they would not wish their little ones exposed to improprieties and indignities of this kind. Under that conviction, we suggest that they inquire into "the sex hygiene" taught at the local public school.

Squandering City Money

THE chairman of the State Tax Commission in Illinois, Mr. William H. Malone, disagrees with the mayor of Chicago as to the reasons why that city finds itself financially embarrassed. The mayor claims that the city's shortage of ready money is due to the "reformers," whose insistence upon a reassessment of the city's taxable assets has prevented the collection of any real-estate taxes at all for the last twenty months. The chairman counters by attributing the city's sad state to "squandering and pay-roll padding which had persisted beyond the limits of human endurance." We cannot sit in judgment upon these two officials. But the contention shows how easily a metropolis can be brought to the verge of bankruptcy.

Federal encroachment upon State rights and duties during the last twenty years has directed some attention to the larger problems of general government. At the same time, the spirit which strives to transfer responsibility from the States to Washington, has been at work almost unnoted in the field of municipal government. So far has lack of interest in municipal elections progressed, that it has been said cynically, but with much truth, that the American plan is to turn the city over to the local political gangsters. Candidates for State and Federal offices are selected with more care. Anyone who can "swing the gang" is qualified for a city position.

As the expenditures of our cities for public purposes are enormous and, in the opinion of some, have grown with a rapidity that should excite suspicion, the evil effects of this indifference are obvious. The largest item in any city budget for public purposes is for the schools, and, as conditions now are, the schools are part of a government controlled by politicians. Whether a school board is large or small, appointed or elected, salaried or giving its services free, the extreme difficulty of properly supervising the expenditure of billions remains. School appropriations are generally popular, and the pleasing delusion that they can never be wastefully or improperly applied is almost universal.

Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty in municipal as well as in larger spheres of government. When an American city falls into financial disorder, the reason is incompetent or dishonest officials, or both. In the absence

of general and intelligent interest in city elections, the incompetent and the dishonest will remain in control.

The Rights of the Church in Education

IT is quite possible that many non-Catholics will experience some difficulty in understanding the bill of rights in education claimed for the Church by the Encyclical of Pius XI. This difficulty is based on the fact that they have never accustomed themselves to the idea of a religious society which is supreme in matters of religion and morality. The spiritual supremacy which Catholics attribute to the Church founded by Jesus Christ, they attribute either to the State, or to themselves in the exercise of their own private judgment.

In the latter case, their philosophy is wholly egocentric and, in its ultimate conclusions, anarchical. Happily, most of these men and women are better than their philosophy. In the first case, however, they involve themselves in a maze of contradictions. As Christians, they cannot vest the secular power with an authority which assuredly Christ never gave it. As Americans, they can hardly admit that a board of aldermen, or a State Assembly, or a Congress, is authorized by any Constitution to rule with finality upon questions of religion and morals. Forced to face an actual conflict, they weakly and meekly yield, as a rule, and bow before the fasces of the State.

Now Catholics find no difficulty, logical or other, in the premises. They respect and obey all legitimate authority legitimately exercised, for the plain reasons given by Our Lord, and repeated by St. Paul. Being Christians, they understand quite well that their highest allegiance is neither to men, majorities, nor civic institutions, but to Almighty God. As a rule, there is no conflict in civilized States between the allegiance they must yield to Caesar, and the allegiance they must give to God. Still, when conflict comes, they will not follow Caesar, but will obey God rather than man. That is the history of Christianity from Calvary to our own day.

Assuredly, the Church recognizes and defends the rights of the State, for it teaches that the State is a perfect society, supreme in its own sphere. But the Church, too, is a perfect society, whose work is to protect the souls of men against evil, and to perfect them by the means instituted by Jesus Christ. It is the mission of the Church to teach; preserved from error by the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit of truth, which was promised by Jesus Christ, the Church necessarily knows what is right and what is wrong. Otherwise, the Church would not be an indefectible teacher but, often, a disseminator of error. Further, as a perfect society the Church is clothed with authority to care for the moral and religious welfare of mankind, to interpret and to enforce the legislation enacted to that end, for it is not a loose aggregation of men and women, held together by emotionalism, nor is it a club, or a debating society. The Church, it cannot be too often repeated, is a perfect society with rights and powers as imperative in their sphere as the rights and powers properly exercised by the State. As civil society strives to aid men in the attainment of their

natural ends, so the Church exercises an independent, supreme, and final jurisdiction in the forum of religion and morals, to aid all men in the attainment of ends that are supernatural.

Assuredly, then, the Church is entitled by every right to examine all systems of education, and to assess their worth in the light of religion and morality. When it is found that a given system deliberately excludes the notion of man's dependence upon Almighty God, thereby destroying in effect the rights of God over the human soul, the Church not only may but must condemn that system. Otherwise it would be false to its Founder's commission to teach all men the ways of salvation. Yielding here, the Church would not be a spiritual authority, but the slave of the State.

Now this position is not accepted, generally, by the non-Catholic, even though he style himself a Christian. When he considers the matter at all, either he himself or the State occupies the position of authority which, in the Catholic view, is held by the Church alone. Hence, in case of serious conflict, Protestantism has almost invariably bowed to the State. The Catholic Church, on the other hand, invariably asserts supremacy in matters of religion and morals. Rome never wears the livery of Caesar.

But the attitude of the Church is not hostile. In education, as in every matter affecting the common good, the spiritual power is ready to confer with the civil power, so that an amicable agreement may be reached on all points of difference. The Church will compromise on methods, but never on principles, and will never yield by any act which questions its right to rule with finality on matters of Faith and morals. But if the education of the child, a long and complicated series of human acts, does not involve both religion and morals, then nothing does. Education, therefore, for reasons "absolutely superior to other reasons of the natural order," belongs "pre-eminently," as Pius XI writes, to the Church. Otherwise, we have the predominance of the civil power in the sphere of religion, morality and conscience. And that is a condition equally abhorrent to our constitutional ideals and to the principles of Christianity.

Tears of the "Times"

DISCUSSING the Papal Encyclical on Education, the editor of the New York *Times* admits on January 20 that "many of the sentiments which he (Pius XI) expressed on the subject are admirable and lofty, and would be accepted by great multitudes who are not Catholics." But the editor is not at peace, for the Pontiff's "whole thought on the subject of education by the State appears to be . . . against American ideals and practice." The Pope's policy can never be accepted in America, he concludes, "until America ceases to be what it has always been until now."

As to American "practice," the *Times* must know that for many years before the formation of this Republic, and for many years after that event, schools in which the teaching of religion took the first place were

supported wholly, or in part, at the expense of the public. That fact sets a fairly good precedent for American "practice." The sober truth is that when we Americans begin to support religious schools, somewhat after the Quebec plan, we shall draw nearer to, rather than away from, genuine "American ideals."

But we can work up no sympathy whatever with another calm assumption of the *Times*, namely, that the present public-school system is an American "ideal." Dr. Luther Weigle, of Yale, is one of many who have expressed themselves in a manner alien to this mood of the *Times*, and we incline to agree with him. "When the public school ignores religion," Dr. Weigle has said, "it conveys to our children the suggestion that religion is without truth or value. It becomes, quite unintentionally, I grant, a fosterer of atheism and irreligion. The present system reflects the conviction of no one, except such free-thinkers as have been brought up in atheism."

This description can hardly be applied to an American "ideal."

But Dr. Weigle has more to say on this subject. "The ignoring of religion by the public schools of America endangers the perpetuity of those moral and religious institutions which are most characteristic of American life. It imperils the future of religion among us, and with religion the future of the nation itself." (New York *Times*, May 16, 1926.)

We do not think it probable that the Pontiff's desire for a just apportionment of public funds everywhere to schools which are educating millions of Catholic children, will soon be realized in this country. Too many constitutional inhibitions, to say nothing of hatred of the Catholic Church, stand in the way. Still, none of these inhibitions is immutable, and if at some future time the people freely chose to do away with them, we are at a loss to understand how their action would be subversive of "democracy." In our dull vision that free act appears, rather, to reflect democracy. It may also be added that if the public school cannot exist unless pampered and bolstered and favored by the State against and above all other systems, it is hardly an example of an institution made necessary by public demand.

Federal Centralization

THE chief value of Congressional investigating committees lies in the publicity which their findings occasionally receive. In the hope that an investigation proposed by the Hon. Louis Ludlow, a member of the House from Indiana, will not be hid under a bushel we regard with keen interest a bill which he proposes to introduce.

Mr. Ludlow believes, and indeed with reason, that one of the most dangerous political tendencies of the times is summed up in the phrase, "Let Washington do it!" His bill will ask for the appointment of a Committee on Centralization, composed of three members of the House, three of the Senate, and of three authorities on constitutional law, to be appointed by the President on recommendation by the American Bar Association. It will in-

vestigate three specific problems: Has this Government departed from the concept of the Founders who wrote the Constitution, and if so, in what direction? What steps can be taken to make this Government the Government established by the forefathers? Is it advisable to call a Constitutional Convention, so that centralization may be checked by restating the limits upon the Federal Government? The Committee will be asked to make a preliminary report to Congress in December, 1931.

It is to be hoped that Mr. Ludlow's proposal will be accepted. No one who has followed the trend of events at Washington for the last quarter century can deny that it is time to stop to take our bearings. Were the Founders wrong in their supposition that a division of rights and powers between the States and the Federal Union was feasible? Were they correct in their contention that the vast mass of rights, powers, and duties, more closely affecting the daily life of the people, should be administered by the local authorities, leaving the problems of government common to all in the hands of the Federal officials? The practice of the day comes close to a negation of the practice of the Founders and, in our judgment, is a rejection of the political philosophy on which they built.

How long can we go on in peaceable and orderly fashion, with a Constitution resting on one political philosophy, and a Congressional procedure based on the theory that this political philosophy is **certainly outworn** and probably false? Perhaps Mr. Ludlow's committee will focus attention on this dangerous anomaly.

The Criminal Telephone

THE Better Business Bureau of New York warns us of the use of the telephone by dishonest persons. One fraudulent dealer in stocks and bonds, now out on bail, was accustomed to spend from \$6,000 to \$10,000 weekly on long-distance tolls. It was generally agreed that today the telephone is one of the most useful aids at the disposal of organized crime.

Unhappily, there is hardly a modern invention which has not been used for criminal purposes. Besides the telephone, the motor car may be instanced. In cases of robbery and murder, it is common to read that the criminals sped away in their high-powered car, the police following by halts in a rebuilt roadster. The combination of telephone and motor car widens every field of crime immeasurably.

Some years ago, we proposed a Federal Amendment to prohibit all motor cars in excess of one-half of one per cent of one-horse power, and on reading the warning of the Better Business Bureau, we were inclined to suggest another. But reflection convinces us that neither is necessary. Since it is possible to talk from State to State as well as to ride from one sovereignty into another, both telephone and motor car fall under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, and Congress can restrict or totally prohibit their use. In view of the alliance of both with crime, Congress should take this action immediately. No Federal amendment is necessary.

Modernity in Literature

G. C. HESELTINE

THE amazing activity of the human mind is nowhere so much in evidence as in modern literature. By literature I mean, since I feel generous, the whole gamut of current printed matter that litters the bookstalls and libraries. Literature is the recorded expression (to continue the magnanimous mood) of the thoughts of men, and more rarely of women. The number of people who think is really quite large, though we exclude those who only think they think. Of these very few commit their thoughts to paper, even including those who commit other people's thoughts to paper (and they are many).

Yet the printing presses groan night and day under their labor, as well they might: the torrent of books rushes with ever-increasing violence upon a helpless world, sweeping critics and public before it. The biggest libraries are bursting their walls in an attempt to save some of the drops from the fountain of wisdom for posterity. Reviewers can rarely do more than glance hastily through the piles of books they get; readers cannot see more than a few of the works even in their favorite class. No wonder the reading public suffers from mental indigestion. No wonder it is impossible to find a good book until you have waded through a mass of rubbish.

People write for several reasons. Most write for money, many write for notoriety (which they would call fame), not a few write in the hope of posthumous fame, some write because cousin Theophilus has written a book, and some because they have something to say. Some indeed write for several of these reasons, and a few, perhaps, for all of them. There are yet some, no doubt, who write because they cannot help it—like the man who thinks he is the Emperor of China or Amen-hotep—how many we cannot say. But all of them, we may assume, write to be read.

Now the odds against being read extensively, ignoring the odds against being published, are obviously very great. Therefore those who wish to be read must find some trick of making their little drops distinguishable in the torrent of ink. One of the commonest and most successful tricks today is being outspoken, frank, fearless or courageous—sometimes the virtuous adjectives will be changed to daring, true-to-life—you have your own special equivalents. All these terms may be grouped under the general one of "shocking," or to be more accurate, if less polite, "pornographic."

Competition in this sphere has produced some remarkable results. When writers set out to reveal the mechanism of sex (presumably unheard-of before) they certainly introduce a new note into literature, and how! They treat of depraved sex for preference, and call their novel a "psychological study"—the "psychology" being of their own concoction and innocent of nothing unless it be an acquaintance with scholastic psychology. It does not matter whether they have anything to say that is worth

saying, or that has not been more effectively and cleanly said centuries ago. It sells like hot-cakes and nothing better.

So we find that almost every one of the best-sellers of recent years (there is no need for me to name them, think of the most familiar titles) on both sides of the Atlantic have contained a seasoning at least of what the world at large calls filth but the publishers may call realism, palpitating life, masterly psychology, and what not. These writers insist on showing us the naked truth, but it must always be rotten with hidden corruption. No one has dared to say so before; now the world shall throw off the ignorance of the ages, and from the new oracles shall come forth knowledge and enlightenment for the first time. Other ages might live blissfully ignorant of the essential corruption of human nature; we are modern and we will wallow in it.

To be one up on this method you not only throw off the shackles of convention in subject matter but also in the manner of writing and printing. Leave out the stops and capital letters and you will be hailed as a genius and your book will fetch as fine a figure as "Ulysses." The final and most perfect evolution of this form is when you omit the letters as well. If some blockhead will only censor or condemn the book, so much the better. If no one takes any notice, your friends must write puffs in the gossip column about your genius and amazing technique. You next send this sort of thing to the highbrow magazines:

On the fifteenth of November in place of what was undoubtedly a reason for finding and in this way the best was found to be white or black, and as the best was found out to be nearly as much as was added.

To be pleased with the result.
I think I was.

Thus, Miss Gertrude Stein. And she probably was. For there are always plenty of boobs who cannot trust their own common sense and will gape with awe and believe when they are told that this is the latest advance in writing, very modern and very clever. So once the epoch-making revolution in letters has occurred and it has been displayed in print, there will be a mad rush of followers anxious to be up-to-date, and they will pay a publisher to print:

(whose girlfriend? why that one throwing
with such a studied gesture of bored ease
ringS of bluE smoke bedad he's an Aristo
'wherever the Best
People meet, you
know')

seems strangely to prefer the jew Gayboys

in the hope of achieving immortal fame. For that is taken from "Oxford Poetry, 1928"—it will be worse in 1929 (if Progress is a reality), and no doubt they do the same

sort of thing at Harvard and Yale. Small wonder that anyone prefers the "jew Gayboys." But as likely as not the writer will have a steady sale before long. For he has the great advantage of being a modern, three whole centuries ahead of the poor fish who wrote:

Night's candles are burnt out and jocund day
Stands tiptoe on the misty mountain-tops.

The usual defence of the no capital letters, no stops, uneven lines, no rhymes, bad rhymes, unintelligible sentences, sex-psychology, and *lingua cloaca*, is that the writers have something to express that cannot be expressed within the confines of conventional language, that they need a more advanced technique for their advanced thought. This presumes that they have something better to say than the wisest of their predecessors who used the traditional language as it came to their hand. It is also a confession of incapacity to handle the material of their craft without battering it beyond recognition.

The new technique has, to be just, two very decided advantages. The first is that it is proof against parody and satire: the more preposterously you parody it the more it looks like the real thing; the second is that it is proof against printers' errors: misprints will make no difference to the meaning for the reader.

If you say that you cannot make head or tail of the misused language or see any new light in the naked libido, you are told pityingly that that is due to your ignorance. It is significant that the same charge is equally incontrovertible when you have admitted your inability to find genius in a piece of honestly elementary and ignorant literature. For all real nonsense is incontrovertible. But the world is full of people whose greatest fear is to be thought ignorant or unprogressive. And so the bluff works.

We need not suggest that the modern extremists, either in matter alone or in manner also, are conscious charlatans. Many of them believe that they are making an advance on their predecessors. People who can write like that can believe anything. The trouble is that so many other people are gulled into thinking that there may be something in it. There is generally money in it, and/or limelight, and nothing more.

We have yet to hear of the Great Idea expressed by the Jazz-print or sordid school, which could not be, or has not been, expressed better in plain English. The greatest thoughts of all time have been very well expressed in the best language of their day, so that those who could read could understand. Nothing has survived that was expressed in a manner so advanced as to be ludicrous or incomprehensible to its own age.

A more critical attitude in the public would speedily kill much modern nonsense. Have the courage to say you like a thing or you do not like it, that you can understand it or you cannot, that you think it might be worth a better understanding or you do not, and let the wise-crackers and the highbrows go hang. Most of the modern fantastic and daring literature will cease to be written if

We who now behold these present days
Have eyes to wonder, but lack tongues to praise.

Obituary

MYLES CONNOLLY

YOU would have liked Eneth Westfaul. I did. Almost everybody did. He was a clear-eyed little blonde man of about thirty-five. He had a habit of spreading his shoulders and walking with a bit of a roll like a big man. This husky swagger of his was amusing. You knew when you saw it that there was a time in his youth when Eneth had lamented that he was not a huge fellow. His ideas were big, always had been big, but his efforts to walk and talk up to them had failed years back. All he had left were the hunched shoulders and the heroic gait.

Eneth had a precise way of thought and speech that would fool you at first. You would say: here is a thinking man. Afterwards, you would discover that his smartness was a metallic thing, a crisp mental manner and little else. I suppose you could say that his thought was mostly form and little substance. But he was what is generally known as a smart man. He dressed with definite good taste. His desk was always neat. He spoke with a sparkle in his eyes and a flash of small white teeth. His hands and handkerchiefs were always spotless. He was quick-witted and alert. I most often remember him as a bare-headed figure standing on his lawn at sunset and watching with satisfaction the enormous shadow his little self cast. Eneth could even believe in his own shadow.

Do not underrate Eneth. He was a unique and successful person. He had achieved an income of some twenty-five thousand a year. This income he put to excellent use, saving some, spending some, gambling some. But to Eneth's credit it must be said that he spent little and gambled less. At thirty-five, Eneth had nothing to worry about. He was able to view with a benign and contented tolerance the extravagances of weak, silly people like myself. We could never hit off that cocksure life system of Eneth. And he knew it.

He had achieved with ease and with a comparatively small income that security which is nothing and yet is so difficult, so almost impossible, for some of us to attain. Every time he spoke, every time he came forward in greeting, you could read in his smile, in his little swagger, that thinly shining inner superiority. If he were a big man, as I have said, you would have leveled him out. But he was such a miniature, standing there with hunched shoulders and flashing eyes and white teeth, that you could do nothing but smile down at him. I disliked him for his attitude to life. And yet, he was such a perfect cameo representation of that attitude that I had to like him. He was a bad idea delightfully expressed.

I shall explain what I mean. Eneth was a point of view. He was the ideal, the dream man of Arthur Brisbane and H. G. Wells. He read both of them and believed both of them. All the manufactured little pastilles and capsules of history and science, he swallowed like so much marmalade. Their scrapings of knowledge and philosophy were to him the very meat of life. In his way, he was as smart as either of them, but somehow they

seemed to have found their way into profitable print first. I am sure that he could have passed off as Mr. Wells in most any gathering. He had a sermonical manner, an unctuous self-assurance. But always there was the flash of his white teeth and smile. He epitomized modern thought. He was Elbert Hubbard with a smattering of scientific phraseology. He had read Anatole France, "The Golden Bough," "The Outline of History" and "The Outline of Science." He had had an engineering-college education, had spent some hours at the telescope and microscope. There was nothing on earth or in heaven that he couldn't explain. He would butt any mystery or miracle with his mind and, head down, push his way through. He was a supreme product of modern thought and knowledge. And he knew it.

The reason I liked Eneth Westfaul was because I could not take him seriously. If ever a man wanted to be taken seriously, if ever a man expected to be taken seriously, it was he. He would do the smiling; you weren't supposed to smile. But I had to smile—he was such a precise, concise, lucid, egotistical little bundle of misinformation and mistakes. There were two traits that especially entertained me; one was the thorough and assured way he had mapped out his future, and the other was the constant and meticulous care he gave his health.

Eneth did not smoke or drink. He ate sparingly of meat. His lunch consisted always of lettuce, crackers and milk. He would sit with his healthy little face beaming over his crackers and milk and smile at me intent on my meat and potatoes. There would be sympathy in his smile and indulgent understanding. He knew I was doomed to inefficiency and an early grave. I was paying the price that all easy-going inferior people pay. He had done what he could. He had told me again and again the importance of light eating and a sensible diet. He had warned me against meat and alcohol. How should I ever become alert and progressive and fully alive? I was getting fat. He had a horror of getting fat. It would have disturbed him to be told how Shakespeare was fat and Thomas Aquinas and Napoleon and Beethoven. But eventually his faith in thin, steel-like men like Coolidge would have explained the facts away. Eneth could explain anything away. And always with a smile.

His belief in what he called "modern science" and his idea that you can only be alert and healthy by generally making yourself miserable were extremely amusing to me. But even more amusing was the way he worked and planned as if he were to live forever. All his activities and schemes pointed toward some almost infinitely distant day. He did not state or describe any such day. But you felt that there was some such day when you talked with him. He gave you the idea that his life was converging toward a magnificent and desirable point.

This is rather vague, I admit, but it is the only way I can express it. I suppose the mind of man tries, even against the most hostile ideas, to assign a greater purpose to his life than the facts justify. The intellect is constantly urging on us a greater design for our existence than the design we ourselves have chosen or accepted. There is something supremely great possible for even the

most ordinary and unfortunate of us. Eneth knew this in a vague way. But Eneth's great day, his distant and desirable point, was an illusion. I am sure that Eneth never, even in his most lucid hours, asked himself: *Quo Vadis?* or "What's It All About?" He jumped the issue by being fervently busy with the duties of the day.

But the time came when he could not jump the issue. For finally he met with that moment that is the End of All Illusion.

It happened this way. Eneth had dropped into the house just after dinner to discuss the crash in the stock market. He was smiling as usual, but it struck me immediately that there was something strange about his smile. Eneth had lost money, but he took the loss philosophically. It had taught him a lesson, he said, and it would be a long time before he would be caught again. Talk drifted. I mentioned the fact that a million people were reported to have visited the grave of a dead man near Boston, Massachusetts. I remarked that it was peculiar that a comparatively obscure dead man should attract crowds that few living men could attract, and that it was especially peculiar inasmuch as the man was dead for some fifty years. I added that it was interesting that some of the people visiting the grave were cured of various ills, mental and social and physical. I suggested that somebody like Eneth should investigate just what caused these cures and crowds.

Eneth was smiling. "I read about the crowds, too," he said. "I have no desire to investigate them. My impression is that a superstitious religion is an unwholesome and unhealthy thing."

It was then that I studied more closely the new strangeness of Eneth's smile. The distortion of the smile was caused by a red splotch just where the lines of a smile curve under the mouth. I remarked about the splotch. Eneth explained he had cut himself that morning while shaving. He was amused at my solicitude. Those things were nothing. The conversation returned to the stock market.

Two days later, Eneth, the entire Eneth with all his scientific faith, his diet, his plans, his destiny, and his smile, was dead. Some sort of poisoning had started from the cut in his chin and killed him.

I went down to the cemetery to see the body before it was cremated. His was an unimportant, resigned little body. It was the first time I had ever seen Eneth when he was not smiling.

SONG ON THE HILL

I thought I heard you whistle up the glen,
A tripping, fluted snatch of song, and then
I felt my heart pound violently and quick,
Like to the tapping of a blind man's stick.

And then I watched the sunset all alone
Splashing its golden spray upon your stone;
And in the distance heard a night bird trill
A tripping snatch of song from some far hill.

J. R. N. MAXWELL.

Does Latin America Love Us?

WILFRID PARSONS, S. J.

WE Americans like to be liked. We are never tired of telling how much we like the Latin Americans. Our present President went all the way down to Chile to let them know that very thing. Good-will missions have gone by land, sea and air. Yet it is hardly possible to deny that a hostile sentiment for us possesses many Latin Americans. It is true, they imitate us in many ways, which may be taken as flattery. But it is just as true that we often irritate them exceedingly, and sometimes with the best intentions of doing otherwise. Just a glance at the South American press will convince us of it. The evangelist Stanley Jones, in "The Christ of the Andean Road," confesses that "to be a North American was a handicap, a real one." Individually they like us, or at least most of us, and we like them, when we meet them. It is to be feared that their attitude toward us as a nation is compounded of fear, contempt and dislike.

Is it just because we are big and most of them are little? Is it because we are "successful," that is, rich, and most of them are struggling? Is it merely because we are alien in race, traditions and religion? Many Latin Americans are making an honest attempt to analyze their feeling towards us and it may be worth while to gather some of their findings together and present them for an honest consideration. Why is it that we have aroused an unfortunate opinion that exists so strongly against us nowhere else on the globe except in England?

First among the reasons I find the Monroe Doctrine. This statement usually arouses no little astonishment among North Americans. The Monroe Doctrine was adopted precisely for the protection of the Central and South American States. It operated for their national independence. Why then should it be resented? For one reason, because few people like to be protected, and fewer nations, for it argues a subordinate position. It is the idea of protection as contained in the word *protectorate* which makes many a Latin American see red. Then, too, many things have been done in the name of Monroe not justified by the original doctrine. To the Latin American the Monroe Doctrine is only a typically "Anglo-Saxon" subterfuge for aggression and annexation. Our steady march from Mexico through Central America to northern South America is disquieting, to say the least, and it is none the less a fact.

Many Americans do not know how far we have gone in this political penetration. The Antilles are practically ours: Cuba by a protectorate, Hayti by occupation, San Domingo by customs supervision, Porto Rico and the Virgin Islands by possession. Mexico had its sovereignty impaired by us when we gave Obregon arms to put down a rebellion, and still further in the past two years, when we made ourselves responsible for its government, until it is now almost in the position of Cuba; Guatemala is practically ruled by American fruit inter-

ests; our citizens control the finances of Salvador; we intervened in Honduras in 1924; we now occupy Nicaragua and are surveying for a canal there; Costa Rica owes its Government to our intervention in 1919; Panama is a protectorate of ours, and we own the Canal Zone. On the continent of South America we have financial advisors in the Governments of Ecuador and Peru, while Bolivia's finances are controlled by an American committee. The other six Republics are, so far as is known, as yet free from American domination. This penetration has taken place in twenty years; it has been steady and rapid. It is no wonder that the remaining States live in a condition of irritated expectation.

The economic penetration of Latin America has been even more complete than the political. Our investment in Latin America has grown from \$290,000,000 in 1900 to \$1,500,000,000 in 1914 and to \$5,200,000,000 in 1928.

United States firms control the meat trade of the Argentine; the tin of Bolivia; Chilean copper and nitrates; Colombian oil; Cuban sugar, railroads, telephones and electric power; most of Mexican oil, its telephone and telegraph systems, and much of its metal mines; Peruvian vanadium, and most of its oil and metal mining; Central American fruit, railways, chicle and oil; Haytian and Dominican sugar ("Latin America and the United States," Catholic Association for International Peace, p. 38).

Besides, American banks finance and control many public improvements, agriculture, Brazilian coffee, etc. Following this economic expansion is the Coolidge doctrine of protection of Americans abroad, which in practice means something very like the extraterritoriality which China has just abolished as a sign of political serfdom. We have even gone so far as to forbid the making of loans, granting of concessions, building of railroads. Latin Americans feel our heavy hand upon them all the time.

What makes the situation more difficult is that these countries are mostly producers of raw material, not manufactured goods. These raw materials are either permanent (oil, metals) or seasonal (agriculture, fruits, coffee). Both need large capital to finance them, and railroads to carry them. The countries are poor, American capital pours in, concessions are handed out, titles to mining land are taken, wages are relatively high but the labor is unskilled, and the vast majority of the profits goes into foreign hands and out of the country. Following the lead of Mexico, country after country has adopted the doctrine of national ownership of national resources and a Calvo clause forbidding diplomatic protection for foreigners. In cases where title has already been taken, execution of the theory of national ownership means confiscation, sometimes without compensation. In other cases, title remains with the State, but the foreign concessionaire has to pay high in production and export taxes. This is not Communism, but rather a theory of partnership, by which the State supplies capital in the form of the raw material, and expects to have at least as much in the way of return

as do the banks and corporations. This struggle has not yet been fought out to its conclusion and much bad blood will be engendered until it is.

After the political and economic sources of irritation come the social and religious. It is hard enough for people of different nations to understand each other; it is doubly hard when one of the groups is Latin and Christian and the other is mostly Northern, and atheistic in its educational, family and business relations. It is hard to say it, but the average Latin American has no very high opinion of us. He sees our great number of divorces, which are sanctioned in most Protestant religious circles and which to him are merely legalized concubinage. The preaching of birth control is another scandal, even worse. He hears of the very low standard of civic conduct among us, with a string of Teapot Domes extending throughout our history. He reads of our shock at similar conditions in his country and calls it hypocrisy. We preach democracy incessantly to him, and when he looks at us he sees only Prohibition, which to him is merely tyranny. Dictatorships are not uncommon to him, but he sees little difference between that kind of despotism and one exercised by a few rich men, through campaign contributions, basely allied with so-called evangelical and reform organizations.

In the realm of ideas the United States has two exports: the philosophy of industrialism, and Protestantism. It is perhaps not generally known to what an extent these two arouse opposition in Latin America. This opposition is in turn aggravated by the vigorous anti-American propaganda engineered by France and Spain, which hitherto have striven with each other for the intellectual leadership there and find themselves both menaced by an intruder, just as the lost British leadership in business has been the cause of another propaganda against us.

The principal indictment against the industrial philosophy is that it leads to discontent and creates apt followers for radical agitators. It is essentially a philosophy of this world, of materialism, of comfort, pleasure and ease, in a word, of prosperity. Now it is a quality of the goods of this world that they do not satisfy; the more you have of them the more you want. Possession brings desire, not content, and desire engenders cupidity and envy. Wrench the peon out of his village environment and plunge him into that of this philosophy, with none of the safeguards of his former religion, and you have all the makings of an ideal Bolshevik. South Americans have already bitterly experienced the results of industrialism, and the reaction of both Catholics and non-Catholics is one of intense opposition. Fortunately, there are signs that large American employers of labor in Latin America are beginning to see this and to take steps accordingly.

The Protestant invasion is of another kind and merits a separate article. But there is no doubt that it is one of the principal causes of friction. John W. White, a correspondent writing to the *Chicago Daily News*, calls it "one of the most pernicious American influences in South America." It is his opinion that nothing has been more harmful even to good business relations between the South American countries and the United States, than

American Protestant activity. Curiously enough, it is former President Roosevelt who is given credit, rightly or wrongly, for the invasion. In the famous Nahuel Huapi interview, given to Francisco P. Moreno, in answer to the question: "Do you believe in a relatively rapid absorption of these Latin countries by the United States?" the Colonel answered promptly: "I consider it far off and very difficult, as long as these countries are Catholic."

Now this to us might mean that his conclusion was that therefore it would never happen, but it is not so taken in South America, where it is often quoted. There it means nothing except that Roosevelt was in favor of de-Catholicizing Latin America, as a prelude to its absorption by the United States. It is important also to keep in mind that the opposition to Protestant activity is not confined to believing and practising Catholics. It is perhaps even more acute, for nationalistic reasons, among so-called "liberals," that is, those who are not believers or practising Catholics. It seems to be a rooted belief that Protestant missionaries are only the advance guard of American imperialism and of economic and political penetration and ultimate absorption. To make it worse, these missionaries have thought themselves justified, writing home for money, in painting lurid, lying pictures of Latin moral and social degradation, forgetting that their letters, books and articles are re-imported into South America, where they are translated for the edification of the native whose conversion thus begins by insulting him.

There are certain truths and practices which Americans must keep in mind, if we are to maintain peaceful relations with Latin America. We shall have to practise our own doctrine of the equality of nations. We all but ruined Pan-Americanism when we wrecked the Central American Court of Arbitration by refusing to obey the first decision that went against us. The Pan-American treaty of arbitration slumbers peacefully in the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, with little prospect of being reported out. If we persist in believing in act that our size and power give us rights denied to smaller and weaker nations, we are destined to be, as we have been in the past, mere sowers of hatred and suspicion. Unless we are animated by the principles of justice, charity and *noblesse oblige*, we are going to be the most hated nation on earth.

THE EXACTING GUEST

Fur cape and shiny leather came to play
With tattered pinafore and patched cloth shoe.
The hostess, once her primal shyness flew
Before the eager wish to please, in gay
And confident delight brought molded clay,
Clothes pins with twiny hair, and beads, her few
But treasured toys. The guest said brusquely, "You
Should have a doll like mine," then turned away.

Small solace can a longing spirit find
Content to diet on its dreams and sighs,
So in the closet corners of the mind
My anxious fingers grope. What if no prize
Of deed or word should bless the hopeless quest
When I am host, the world my golden guest?

JOHN GILLAND BRUNINI

Old Simeon Stylites

MILES J. CHRISTIE

I HAD finished the lecture, answered half a dozen questions, and was now standing by the door. I knew there would be a few more questions. There were three or four in the extension class too shy to ask questions in public. The questions were asked. They ranged from psychoanalysis to Anglican Orders. When there was a lull, a young lady teacher of history from Central High broke in:

"Professor," she said, and she seemed excited, and a bit angry and talked very rapidly, "Professor, is that true about Simeon Stylites?"

"Is what true?" I queried.

"Why, what Bruce Barton says. That about 'Old Simeon Stylites.' You'd think Simeon Stylites was his grandfather. 'Old Simeon Stylites!' I think it's a bit thick, the way these syndicates impose on ignoramuses like me. Just trading on ignorance."

"Does he say 'Old Simeon Stylites'?" I asked.

"Yes, Old Simeon Stylites. He's just bitter. That's what he is. Wants to give a whack at the Church. Just trying to be clever . . ."

"May be," I said, "and maybe you're wrong. There were two Simeons, both Stylites. One is Simeon the Elder, the other is Simeon the Younger. Mr. Barton must have been referring to the Elder, and called him Old Simeon for short."

"Two, were there?" she said sharply. "Well, I don't believe Bruce Barton knew that much. He was just trying to put one over on us ignorant readers."

"Ignorant readers!" I said. "What about the poor editor and poor Mr. Barton himself? Perhaps the editor was fooling you, and Mr. Barton was fooling the editor, and some fifth-rate pamphleteer was fooling Mr. Barton. We ought to be charitable. Maybe there was no malice at all. Just pure ignorance. Anyway, what did Mr. Barton say about Old Simeon Stylites?"

"Why, Professor don't you know?" She seemed surprised that a professor of history should be so ignorant. "It was in all the papers."

"Not in all," I objected. "I read some of the papers."

"Well, read that," she said, and handed me a clipping with the incriminated words scored in blue.

I read: "Old Simeon Stylites believed that it is the business of a saint to mortify the body. He chained himself to the top of a pillar, and became so loathsome that worms lived in his flesh, and he did not attempt to pick them out because he regarded his suffering as a means of grace."

Before I had finished, she broke in: "What do you think of that, Professor?"

"Jazz history," I answered. "Syncopation of the facts, and overtones from the imagination. Needs a lot of ignorance, and a dose of bigotry, perhaps, to write a tune like that. But you see, it can be done."

The young lady's eyes glittered with delight. On the

rostrum I never permit myself such waggishness. But just then I wanted to get the reaction from the young lady.

"So, it's all bosh? I knew it was bunk," she asked and answered herself. "I simply refuse to believe that about the flesh became loathsome. If that were true, I'd have a difficulty against the Faith."

"Against the Faith? Nonsense. Of course, you wouldn't. Might as well say that a military hospital in war time or an insane asylum is a difficulty against the science of anatomy or rational psychology. A few men with wooden legs do not destroy the normal truth about the human body. A few men in an asylum do not destroy your faith in the essential sanity of the human mind. . ."

"But is it true?" she urged.

"Well, I can show you something like that in a printed book," I said teasingly, and I watched the effect. . .

"In a printed book!" She fairly gasped. Like many high-school teachers I know, she had all the credulity of the ordinary newspaper reader. She was a victim of superstition in regard to the printed word.

We were in the large library-auditorium where I lecture. Stacks of books jutted out from three of the walls. I moved off towards the history section, and she followed.

"Would you like to see that in real print?" and I reached for volume thirty-two of the *Texte und Untersuchungen*, which, as every historian knows, contains the most authentic texts of all the earliest accounts of Simeon Stylites. I opened to Theodoret's account.

"Oh, that's Greek to me. I don't believe Bruce Barton could read that."

"Well, it would be Greek to him too. It is Greek to me. It is Greek. This is Latin," I added, pointing to the marvelous Life by the "disciple" Antonius. "And this is a German translation of the amazing account of Simeon that was written in Syrian Arabic. And here you have what the most critical scholar in the world in regard to these lives thinks of them, and here you have his own critical life in German. Now listen to this from good 'old' Antonius. Apologies for reading it to a lady! But I want to show you that Mr. Barton could have heightened his effect if he had known the documents."

Then I translated: "Because of the fetid odor no one could come near him, and no one knew the reason of the odor. But his bed was full of vermin, and no one could make it out. . ."

She was a modern girl. No shudders. She seemed relieved. "There you are," she broke in, "bed full of vermin. It doesn't say 'worms in the flesh.' I knew it was all just rank bigotry."

"Well, just you listen to this," I said, and I turned over the pages. "Here it says they found a wound in his flesh, and maggots in the wound, and it says that Simeon—aged eighteen, by the way, not yet 'Old

Simeon,'—begged the Superior of the monastery to suffer the putrefaction to remain in order that his soul might be cleansed from the corruption of sin."

Femininity got the better of modernity. "Oh! Professor, I think that is just too disgusting!"

"So do I, and so did the monks in this little romance I am reading. The Superior sent for two doctors, and when Simeon was healed, he was told to go, and never be such a nuisance again."

"Did you say, romance? Isn't that history?"

"History? What do you think of this? Here is an account of the devil coming like an angel of light in a flaming chariot and tempting the saint on the top of his pillar to jump in and take a trip to Heaven. And it says that when he lifted up his leg, it was suddenly stricken with an awful ulcer, and the ulcer began to fester, and multitudes of maggots fell out from the ulcer, and that the saint told his servant to replace the fallen maggots in the wound, and said to the errant maggots: 'Eat what the Lord has given you to eat.' . . ."

"Oh! Professor, please don't. That is just too awful. . . ."

"I know it is awful. But I want you to see what Mr. Bruce might have sold to the poor editor, if Mr. Barton was not depending on second-hand pamphlets for his information. If you can stand this last bit, listen. It tells how a king of the Saracens came for a blessing, and while he was waiting, one of the saint's maggots fell into the king's hand and when the saint asked for his maggot back, the maggot turned into a shining jewel. . . ." She broke out laughing. She saw the point. Mr. Barton by handing out to an unsuspecting public what he did hand out was committing himself to a belief in this wild reach of morbid imagining. "Professor," she said, "how did any one ever come to write stuff like that?"

"That," I answered, "came to be written in much the same way as what Mr. Barton wrote came to be written. It represents the ridiculous and extravagant exaggeration of an untutored imagination, of a mind that is fairly crawling with bugs on the brain. And, as you know, a bug in a bigot's brain is a more terrible thing than a worm in a person's flesh. Of course when an Oriental writes like this for Orientals no one need mind. But when an Occidental hashes it up, and palms it off on an Occidental editor for the consumption of Occidental readers the thing is simply loathsome."

I confess that I had begun to talk a little emphatically, because the point is important. But meantime I was searching for a passage in Theodoret. When I had found it, I waited for a question I knew would come. It came.

"But, Professor, where did Antonius get the idea from? There must have been some foundation. . . ."

"There is," I said. "Here it is in Theodoret. Theodoret is the nearest thing we have to history concerning the vermin of Simeon, and even this is only hearsay—just what one Oriental told another Oriental. Here is where Mr. Barton's authority got the story about the chain. Mr. Barton, of course, is all mixed up about it. The chain episode comes long before Simeon went to live on the top of a pillar. He was living on the top of

a mountain, and had a wall built around him, and a chain with a leather cover fastened to his right leg. Well, when he was in this fix he was visited by the Bishop of Antioch, and the Bishop of Antioch told him to take off the chain, and let it suffice to have the will throw a chain of reason about his body. And of course Simeon obeyed. Now here's where the vermin come in. So get ready. Note that to keep the flesh from harm Simeon had had the iron chain covered with leather—so far was he from wanting his flesh to fester. Well when they tore off the leather, out fell no less than twenty little leather fleas. Twenty little leather fleas lurking in the leather! If you stripped the leather from the chairs in many a modern home you would find more than twenty little leather fleas. And the historian says that he tells this detail about the twenty little leather fleas because it implies that though the saint might have killed them he was content to practise himself for greater trials by submitting to this little nuisance."

"Is that all?" And she began laughing again.

"Well, that is all there is in history about the 'worms.' About the 'loathsome flesh' all we learn is that when the saint was on the top of the pillar he developed a kind of bed sore. There is not a word about the flaming chariot, or the dropping maggots in Theodoret. The reason why Simeon Stylites did not 'attempt to pick out the worms from his flesh' is because there were none to pick out. Mr. Barton has mixed up bugs in the brain and worms in the flesh."

If You Go Abroad

HILAIRE BELLOC

(Copyright, 1930)

IF you go abroad, for however short a space of leisure, there are certain suggestions which may be useful to you. I am prepared to make them, because I have done a great deal of foreign travel, and not only learnt what may be done, but also—a longer lesson!—what to avoid doing. On the other hand, any suggestion made by one person is limited not only by his experience, but by his habits. One can never tell how far the advice will coincide with the needs of those one is addressing.

However, for what they are worth, there are certain rules I would suggest.

In the first place, read about the place you propose to go to, and read about it at your leisure some time before you go. Most advice of this sort is published, I find, in the season when people are likely to travel. The right way to begin is to prepare your mind in the season before traveling.

And when you read, read rather the history of what you are going to see than the geography or descriptions of monuments. Landscape and buildings you will discover for yourself, and you will find them to be so different from what your reading about them led you to imagine that you had better undertake them on the spot, and not beforehand. But with the history of a place, or a road, or a district, it is otherwise.

You should get a good, clear outline of its story well

into your mind before you start. And when you have that fixed, it intensifies the interest of travel prodigiously. Indeed, it is not a bad idea to choose specially for your line of travel something with which your historical reading has made you already familiar.

The main trouble about this is that history, to be of any use to you, must have a broad basis. In other words, you ought to do a solid piece of reading upon the past of the places you are going to visit, beginning at the beginning, till you see it as a continuous whole. It means a certain amount of concentration, but not many books. One book is usually enough—one paragraph on a town. And it is worth the trouble.

Next I should say: Do not be frightened of an unknown language. All you need for travel is to know how to make yourself understood in a dozen necessary phrases, and if you have these, any number more will come to you in quite a few days. Remember that this is the way in which languages are naturally learnt. You learn to write them thoroughly, by a long course of grammar and the rest; but for making yourself understood you need do nothing of the sort. I never knew anyone yet who was compelled to spend even a few days in a country where no one knew his own tongue who did not pick up in those few days a sufficient vocabulary in the foreign tongue to carry on with.

Next I should say (but I am afraid it will sound absurd to most people): Do not be deterred by the expense. By this I obviously do not mean "Pay no attention to money"—for there is a limit to every one's expenditure, large or small. I mean, rather, do not think that you cannot travel to a place because you have not available the sum which the same journey costs another. Do not accept general estimates of what your expenditure will be. There is a certain minimum to which you can reduce travel *from the foreign port onwards*, and that minimum is not very much more than what your expense would be at home.

But I have to say "from the foreign port onwards," because, unfortunately, there is one item which is irreducible, and that is the cost of crossing the sea. It has gone up enormously in the last few years, it is generally in the hands of a monopoly without competition, and it is only in certain rare cases that you can take advantage of common transport by sail or in a tramp ship. But once you are landed, the minimum limit of your expenditure is pretty well in your own hands. But remember that to keep it so there is a certain discipline to be learned.

The first part of this discipline is to behave as the poorer people of the country do. Spain, for instance, is not a dear country to travel in, as most people imagine; it is quite cheap—but only on condition that you eat and sleep as the average man of the country does. If you try to get northern conditions, and especially northern luxuries, you will naturally have to pay fantastic prices; and this is true of every country that I ever visited. Things foreign to that country, if obtainable at all, are only obtainable at a very great cost; so do without them, however necessary they may be to you at home. It is a difficult lesson, but once learned, it makes you free of the world.

Added to this, learn all you can before you start, or by keeping your eyes open when you reach the foreign port, in order to learn there what special advantages for travel there are in each country. For instance, the Belgian system of a cheap ticket whereby you may go anywhere for a fortnight over the whole country. Or again, the French system of registering baggage whereby for a few pence you get your bag taken from station to station where you can meet it on a walking tour. Or again, the enormous and most efficient network of cheap and good motor buses all over modern Italy, every one of which, with its hours of starting and arriving, is in the common railway guide. Or again (what nearly everybody neglects, save on a few main rivers), the chances of travel by water.

If you have the health and the habit, walk when you can. And perhaps the best way of using that method is to alternate your walks with stretches by rail. A man does not really see any country except when he is walking or riding through it. But if you are condemned to the rail or to petrol, take short days, and prefer for petrol by-roads and for the rail secondary lines and light steam tramways. I have covered up pretty well the whole of France in this way in the course of my life, and have hardly ever met upon the little local light railways which abound in that country anyone but the local people. Foreign travel has not discovered these slow local lines.

And a last advice I would give is this. Get your maps before you start and use them thoroughly. With a good map you can make any amount out of a small district. You can radiate within thirty miles of a town like Angers and see enough to fill as many days as you like, and leave a mass of landscape and monuments unvisited. And the map gives you this further advantage with the commendation of which I will end.

It shows you what places are off the main communications; and those are the very districts which best repay the traveler. Wherever you see a large space of country with few railways and few main roads, make for that. You will never regret it.

Thus may you see all the great forests of the Ardennes within twelve hours of London, or the more distant Auvergne, or the emptier parts of the Jura within twenty-four.

AS ONE WHO VISITS ROME

As one who visits Rome to see what most,
Since first he read in books, he longed to see—
The pulsing heart of Christianity
And pagan splendor's melancholy ghost—
Then wastes his precious moments in a host
Of petty trifles, grumbling at a fee,
Exploring shops, decrying hostelry,
And in St. Peter's thinks of tea and toast:

So down celestial avenues I pass
Amid the marvels of Christ's ordinance
Outlasting all man's monuments of brass.
The Living Altar gets a careless glance;
And some discomfort or a mild mischance
Can make me miss the glory of the Mass.

JAMES J. DALY, S. J.

Sociology

Sincerity in Law Enforcement

MARK O. SHRIVER

AS a great many people now know, the misprision-of-felony act, originally passed about 1790, was reenacted as an integral part of the criminal code (Federal) which became effective in 1926. The act provides that any one having actual knowledge of the commission of murder or other felony must, under penalty of fine and imprisonment for three years, report such felony to proper Federal authority. Now as homicides generally occur on State territory, and Federal authority is not concerned with what goes on there, the Federal Government punishes murderers only occasionally. There are other felons, however, who constitute a great bother to administrations in Washington. Under the Jones Act, which became effective in the spring of 1929, many violations of the Federal Prohibition Act have been raised to the dignity—or the indignity—of felony and it is, of course, the duty of all citizens to report such violations. Hence some who read this paper may feel that it is their duty to report me, unless, my relations be circumspectly and discreetly set down. Consequently, most of these "confessions" must be after a fashion of indirection or, as the newspapers have it, "it is said."

Let us begin the homily with Dr. Doran who has been investigating the grape trade in California to ascertain whether or not evil-minded men there are selling grape juices—unfermented but fermentable—to citizens in search of seductive stimulant. Of course the Doctor might get some information from members of the Senate who have made damaging admissions in personal correspondence, and from other legislators who have made no admissions at all, and have even pleaded not guilty to indictments. But he went, nevertheless, at the public expense.

That is the sort of thing which manifests the puerility of this whole farce of Prohibition enforcement. Practically everybody knows that such juices are made and are sold, and many of us have received circulars telling us what not to do, lest the alcoholic content be raised to an illegal point. If the Prohibition people really wanted to enforce the laws, there would be no difficulty in making a beginning anywhere with knowledge that is now general.

The United States attorney for my bailiwick has got a great deal of publicity by an announced intention of enforcing this misprision business to the limit. But, surely he must be unobservant, or unable to draw conclusions from known facts, or so spotless from the world as to be unsuited to his high office. How else can he excuse his failure to bring to the attention of his own forces the flagrant violations in his own city and State? In his own rural community, there is said to be a still on every other farm, and since he is a man of high connections he can scarce help noting the evidence from the breath of his friends. But perhaps he feels that smelling alone is insufficient (as his own Circuit Court of Appeals

has recently held to his manifest discomfiture) but he need not rely on smell alone. The plain fact is that the laws are glaringly violated, that practically every man knows of the violations, and that nobody gives a hoo. I say the laws are glaringly violated. Perhaps that needs the particularization and specification which shall be discreetly furnished.

A man named, let us say Jones, and add that he is no relation to the distinguished Senator and author of legislation, was operating a notorious speakeasy. After several vain searches the alert and agile agents finally caught him with the goods. Indeed they caught him twice, and the second time his place was padlocked. The place has been called a "speakeasy," but as a matter of fact it was simply an old saloon running as it had run for decades before Prohibition, and for pretty nearly ten years after it. The door opened on an important thoroughfare, and thousands passed by every day. Just inside was a big rosewood bar, with all the familiar trimmings, across which beer, whiskey, and other wet goods were liberally dispensed. Perhaps the bartenders did exercise certain discretion as to customers, but anybody could buy near-beer, and the foods that were available, and anybody could walk in from the street with never a wink or a whistle. That place ran for years. On Saturday nights, the curbs for blocks around were lined with motor cars, and inside, the bar was crowded two and three deep with genial souls, some of whom, inspired by the atmosphere or something stronger, chanted mournful ditties in those weird tones which were once known as "whiskey tenors." One would think a child could have spotted the joint, but the agents did not. And when they closed the shop, the owner is said to have met an irregular patron not thoroughly conversant with all his activities, and to have extended an invitation to his new place less than two blocks from the old, where business was and is as before. It ought not to be hard for conscientious agents to stop that sort of thing, but it is not stopped.

It goes on in New York, in St. Louis, in Denver, in San Francisco, in every city of the country, and while Federal agents may be unaware of the illicit traffic, no one else is. The Eighteenth Amendment was ratified eleven years ago, but everywhere, from Canada to Mexico, potent intoxicants are as available as soda water or Coca Cola. On a half-hour's telephone notice, gins and whiskeys will be delivered to home, office or club. Indeed there is scarcely a club where liquors are not openly and regularly consumed. Not that the clubs sell them, of course, for that sort of thing is avoided, but intoxicants are consumed, liquors and liqueurs which are compact, and wines and beers which are bulky and hard to handle. Jones, let us say, not the Senator, will deliver Canada ale, 500 miles from the Canadian border, for twenty-five cents a bottle, and it is said to be good ale too.

Years ago there was a ragtime song with the refrain "Everybody's doing it." In my own circles, which are, as even the President might admit, eminently respectable, that certainly seems to be the truth. All the whiskey one sees cannot be what the labels would indicate. Distillation stopped many years back, and more than a few ware-

houses have been depleted. It is rather likely that some of the Scotch must be from Hoboken, and some of the Gordon Water from perfume plants and lacquer factories. Yet there is plenty of it, such as it is.

If Dr. Doran wants to enforce Prohibition effectively, he should leave the grape-growing agriculturist alone. The Volstead Act was drawn with them in mind, to allow farmers to enjoy fermented juices and to deprive city men of beer, and the whole trend of the decisions supports that manifestly iniquitous policy. Dr. Doran should turn his hand to the new felonies; but it is likely that he is not anxious to do much more than is actually necessary. As the Baltimore *Evening Sun* consistently points out, there are nowhere near enough jails to accommodate our increasing crops of new criminals.

Fifteen millions of dollars have just been appropriated—or was it *only* five millions?—to provide more commodious and more comfortable quarters (including a new confinement house for women) for those already in duress vile in the clutches of the law. Now the army is asked to turn over to the Department of Justice all available surplus cells in the disciplinary barracks for the use of anticipated lodgers, and to reduce unsanitary overcrowding in such hostleries as are maintained in Atlanta, Moundville, and other resorts. And what is perhaps as relevant as anything else, is that if Prohibition could be enforced, and were enforced, a good many thousand gentlemen, clerical and lay, would be deprived of soft jobs at fat salaries, and find themselves obliged to go to work and make an honest living.

Education

Rights of the State in Education

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

IN discussing the Encyclical of Pius XI on education, the Pontiff's exposition of the rights of the State in education must not be overlooked. That the press has overlooked it, is clear from some early comments, which range from the fear expressed by the *New York Times*, that if all the churches establish schools the foundations of the Republic are in danger, to the attack made by the *Birmingham Post*, on the ground that the Encyclical would destroy religious freedom!

These and similar misconceptions are probably due to the fact that the editors did not have the text of the Encyclical before them. The enterprise of the *New York Times* in publishing on January 19 a translation of the document, sent by radio from Italy, should enlighten them. I do not vouch for the accuracy of the *Times* reprint, which in several minor points is obviously incorrect. The best of intentions will not always save the translator who deals with technical phrases, and until the text, or its authorized English translation, comes from Rome, we cannot be certain of the exact wording of several clauses of the Encyclical. On the whole, however, the *Times* reprint, from which I take my quotations, seems to be correct.

The Pontiff views education as a social work to be

carried on in harmony by the Church, the family, and the State. Of these three factors, one, the Church, is supernatural, the others natural. All three are societies, the Church and the State being perfect societies, that is, they contain within themselves all the means necessary to attain their respective ends, while the family, although vested with rights of supreme importance, is an imperfect society. It is called "imperfect" in the sense that to attain its perfection it must, at certain times, and under certain peculiar circumstances, rely on the aid and co-operation of the Church and of civil society.

It follows, therefore, that these three societies all possess rights and duties in education. For education, the Pontiff observes, concerns the whole of man, both individually and socially, both in respect of nature and in respect of grace. Hence it "belongs to all three of these societies, which are necessary to the coordination of their respective ends, in proportionate manner, according to the present order of providence established by God."

Passing over the Pontiff's vindication of the prior rights of the Church and of the family, what does the Encyclical hold with reference to the rights of the State?

First, repeating the doctrine of the great Encyclicals of Leo XIII, Pius XI teaches that the State "must protect and promote, not absorb, families and individuals, and not attempt to replace them." Hence it is the right "or, rather, duty," of the State to protect the rights of the Church and of the family. No Hegelian will admit that the individual is a man before he is a citizen, or that he and the family have rights which are not derived from the State, and which cannot be taken away by the State. But what we may call the American theory of the State, set forth in the Declaration of Independence, in the Federal Constitution, in decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and in the Constitutions and statutes of the several States, generally, admits both of these contentions, and is in harmony with Catholic philosophy. Further, in the Pontiff's view, the State is bound by the natural and the Divine laws in the exercise of its rights and duties—a view which must be accepted by all Christians; that is, by all who believe that the law of the creature cannot be superior to the law of the Creator.

In the next place, when parents cannot, or will not, fulfil their duty to care for the intellectual welfare of the child, the State may intervene. For the right of parents to control the education of the child is not absolute, but, writes the Pontiff, is "dependent upon the natural and the Divine law, and therefore subject to the authority and judgment of the Church, as well as to the vigilance and juridical tutelage of the State which must protect the interests of the community."

The phrases which I have emphasized contain a doctrine which flows from the very nature and purpose of the State. This doctrine is not admitted, merely, but proposed and steadfastly defended by Catholic philosophers. However, even in this case, the Pontiff adds, the State must not take the place of the family, but supplement it, and must give an education "in conformity with the natural rights of the child, and the supernatural rights of the Church." Here, as always, the Pontiff de-

clines to admit the right of any civil society to destroy the rights of any individual, or of the Church.

Thirdly, the State may lay down certain requirements which all schools must meet, and "the Church has no objection to her schools and educational institutions conforming in each nation to the legitimate regulations of the civil authorities." These requirements, it need hardly be said, should be such as to aid the State in attaining the end of civil society, and no others. In case of disagreement, the Church is "ready to reach an understanding with the civil authorities."

Fourthly, it is the right and duty of the State to encourage education, and to complete the work of the Church and of the family, when necessary, "even by means of schools and institutions of its own." For the State may rightly demand "that all citizens have the necessary knowledge of their civic and national duties, and that to the degree of intellectual, moral and physical culture which, in the present condition of our times, is truly indispensable to the common good." But in exercising this right and duty, the State must not infringe upon the rights belonging to the Church or to the family, and thus it may never constrain parents to send their children to schools which they may in conscience disapprove, or in disregard of their "preferences."

Finally, and with the same proviso for the safeguarding of prior rights, the State may found and conduct special schools, needed for "the proper administration of public affairs, and for internal and external defense and peace, all of which are things necessary for the public good, and demand special preparation."

It may be objected that the range of rights assigned the State in this philosophy is somewhat narrow. It is; but only as narrow as Christianity itself. I can understand the indignant and complete rejection of the Encyclical by an atheist, or by a convinced follower of Hegel. But I am quite unable to conceive on what grounds it can be repudiated by anyone who believes in the supremacy of the law of God. I am not prepared to admit that sincere and intelligent non-Catholic Christians are enamored of the secular philosophy of the modern public school. They content themselves, it seems to me, with holding that, under the circumstances, the State can provide nothing better. At heart, then, they agree with the Encyclical of Pius XI; in profession, they yield to the false theory that the State is bound by no law save that promulgated by itself, and constrained by no duty which a majority does not choose to recognize. Hence they part company, perforce, with Rome when Rome condemns secularism in statecraft as well as in education, and boldly asserts that civil society is bound by the natural and the Divine law to defend by every means at its disposal man's natural rights and the supreme rights of God. Briefly, they are forced into a philosophy of desperate negations, while the Pontiff's is a philosophy of positive, Christian, and wholly practicable affirmations for the welfare of the family, of the State, and of religion.

For strive as we may, we cannot get away from the fact that God exists. Least of all can we evade that fact by walking into a classroom. Are these little ones so

much raw material, to be molded or stamped into cogs and cams, each with a function in the great and godless machine of a secular State? Or are they children of God, for whom the Divine Lover of souls gave His life on Calvary? Have they a destiny that transcends time and space and nationality, and is linked with the Godhead itself, or are they brief creatures of a day, destined for the dust? What are they—potential citizens of a passing State, merely, or creatures made in the likeness and image of the living God? Surely, if the child is a human being, with a God to adore, and a soul to save, then these facts must be recognized by the school.

God exists, and in Jesus Christ, Teacher, Law-giver, Founder of a perfect society, with power to bind and to loose, we find the completion of God's revelation to man. We Catholics, then, cannot live as though there were no God, no Christ, no Divine law to be learned, no Divine love to be cherished, no future life to be sought. We shall not forget in our schools to cultivate the mind of the child, or to train him in a loyalty and obedience to all justly constituted authority that is reinforced by his loyalty and obedience to the law of God. But the foundation of our philosophy of education is this: the child must be formed unto Christ.

With Scrip and Staff

OUR good friend, the *Living Church*, expressed some wonder some time ago, that one of the writers in AMERICA, "or its own copy-editor," was led by a peculiar "psychology" to use the expression "the Bishops, priests, and Sisters," in a previous issue. Acknowledging some uncertainty as to capitals in the Anglican communion, the writer observed:

What strikes us in connection with the extract from AMERICA is the futility, even in the Roman communion, of holding out against the feminism of the age. Popes may thunder *ad lib.* against any compromise with it. No matter; if priests themselves—with the smallest sort of *p*—think "priests and Sisters" in their minds, no power on earth or in the vatican [*sic*] can alter the psychology of it. Feminism is triumphant; and if "Sisters" shall desire, in the new regime, to bob their hair, no "priest" can say them nay.

And he concluded:

That a priest is entitled only to a small *p*, everybody is agreed. But when it comes to Bishops and Sisters and Catholics—aye, there's where the secrets of the inmost heart of the writer will be brought to light. The use or the absence of the capital initial is equivalent to a confession.

Just what the psychology of this particular AMERICA writer happened to be, the Pilgrim has not yet ascertained, though his editor attempted to interpret him at the time in the *Living Church*. But for his own part he still regrets to throw cold water on so enthralling an explanation, since the large *B*, the small *p*, and the capital *S* came neither from special deference for the episcopacy, nor self-effacement for the priesthood, nor chivalry for the holy nuns, but merely from the customary rule of AMERICA's "style book." Common nouns and adjectives used as proper nouns or proper adjectives, or used in a special, limited sense, are also capitalized; not from "psychology" but simply as a printer's device to avoid ambiguity.

THE Pilgrim has been tempted at times to wonder if there was some peculiar psychology guiding the different practices of American and European book-binders, or publishers, with regard to the titles on the backs of books and periodicals. Look through a mixed group of books and magazines, French, German, British and American, and you will observe that, with very few exceptions, when the title is printed on the back of a thin book—not across, but running the length of the back—and the book is stood up on end, it runs, in the case of the American-made book, from the top downward; but in the case of the book made abroad, from the bottom up. Hence, in reading such titles on the library shelves, you cock your head to the right to read the American titles, and cock it to the left to read the European titles. When your American books or periodicals are placed one on top of another on the table, with the front cover up, you read them in normal position. When your foreign periodicals are similarly placed, you stand on your head to see the title, or lay the books upside down.

What is the reason for this interesting diversity? Is it really due to some odd psychic strain in either group, by which Europeans are naturally left-minded or topsy-turvy, and Americans right-minded and direct? Or have they their own principle in the matter, which suits their habits of life better than our practice would? Some reader may be able to offer enlightenment.

FULL consistency, after all, can never be obtained, whether in capitalization, or bookmaking, or spelling. Prof. Melvil Dewey, the author of the world-wide system of decimal classification for libraries, has made strenuous efforts all his life to introduce a more consistent system of spelling for the English language. Yet his efforts, so successful in his own specialty, have never made any noticeable impression in this matter. He gives the following startling instance of the inconsistencies of our English method, which also illustrates his proposed cure:

Booker Washington told me that they wud not graduate from Tuskegee one who cud not spel and pronounce correctly this sentence: "Though the rough cough and hiccough plough me through I ought to cross the lough." We markt agenst each letr all the different ways of pronouncing it in English. By simpl permuta-tion this showed over 16,000,000 ways in which this sentence cud be pronounst. Then we markt agenst each sound all the different ways of speling it and proved that there were 66 decilion (66,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000) ways of speling the sentence, each justfyd by analo-jy. Yet he was soliciting mony to teach those poor colord students just which of this infinit variety must be uzed before he cud graduate.

After reading this, we will see a reason for erecting a national monument to the winners of our spelling bees.

JUST how we spell priests and Sisters, may be noted by two great calamities that occurred recently. One was the destruction by fire of the splendid St. Elizabeth's Church, for the colored, in the South Side of Chicago: a loss estimated, I believe, at half a million. The pastor, Father Eckert, S.V.D., the two assistant priests, and Judge Hartigan of the Municipal Court, who was passing, made unsuccessful attempts to rescue the Blessed Sacrament. Finally Father William J. Gorman, chaplain

of the Chicago Fire Department, managed to penetrate to the altar and carry the Blessed Sacrament back to safety.

The other disaster was the burning of the Novitiate of the Missionary Servants of the Blessed Trinity at Holy Trinity, Ala., on January 2. The loss, including that of valuable subscription files, was estimated at from \$100,000 to \$150,000, leaving the Sisters homeless and penniless in a country where very few Catholics live. The self-sacrificing as well as successful work for the Southland of these newly-organized Sisters, is known to many of our readers through their little monthly *S O S*.

TWO young priests of the Archdiocese of St. Paul, Father Paul Bussard, of the St. Paul Cathedral, and Father Edward Jennings, of the basilica of St. Mary, Minneapolis, are aiming to remove the inconsistency which exists between Catholics' attendance at Mass and their inability to follow its words and rites. They are publishing a translation of the complete text of the Mass for every Sunday of the year in a sixteen-page leaflet, a separate leaflet for each Sunday, which will be mailed to subscribers for a dollar a year. The enterprise is on a non-profit-making basis, the priests who are doing the work having volunteered their services for the sake of furthering the liturgical movement. Those who are interested can address the editor of the Leaflet Missal, at the Chancery Building, 244 Dayton Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.

This plan has been followed abroad, particularly in Germany, with great success. Experience will show its adaptability to American tastes and conditions.

The Pilgrim likes the style of the little leaflet; but I think the Latin text of at least the Common of the Mass should be included. Our people absolutely must familiarize themselves with this text. Unless every Catholic without exception can at least read this much of the Latin of the Mass—and there is no excuse for not doing so in the case of those who enjoy a high-school education—we shall never solve the question of church music in this country.

A GREAT help towards better understanding of the words, the ceremonies, and the music of the Mass is offered by another priest and Religious, Dom Adrian Eudine, O.S.B., of St. Michael's Abbey, Farnborough, England, who offers a course of lectures on the Sacred Liturgy: Liturgical Prayer; the Mass; the Use of the Missal, etc.; also a course of lectures on Gregorian Chant. Dom Eudine is an expert and a charming speaker. Arrangements for practical courses to Religious, seminarians, academy and college students, choir directors and organists, can be made by addressing: Rev. Dom Eudine, O.S.B., care of the St. Gregory Guild, 1705 Rittenhouse Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A monument in memory of the late Cardinal Francis Aidan Gasquet, O.S.B., known for his great work on the revision of the Latin Vulgate, is to be erected at Downside Abbey, in England. THE PILGRIM.

Literature

Three Principles for Novels

FRANCIS TALBOT, S. J.

AS part of the complications that life sometimes stages, it was necessary for me, recently, to be present at a luncheon in which Catholic representatives mingled with ladies and gentlemen of various Christian persuasions. All during the luncheon, and during the lengthy discussion that followed it, a fellow-Catholic who is an inveterate smoker of cigarettes refrained from touching the white little rolls. To my amused questionings later, as to the reasons for her most exemplary conduct, she replied: "Smoke cigarettes in the presence of those Bible men and Christian Endeavor women? In that purified atmosphere of utter righteousness? I would be branded and convicted of sin! Far better it is to mortify the olfactory organs than to bring disgrace on our beloved Catholic Church."

The lady, it may be admitted, should not smoke; but if she does smoke, she should do so with prudence and restraint. Her fellow-diners would undoubtedly have been scandalized. Moreover, they would have swollen with an exhilarating burst of their virtuousness in contrast to this exhibition of modern feminine frailty. They would have admitted to themselves, in their own inner hearts, that they were not like this woman. Some Catholics would have had the same emotions as the diners. But, to the best of my knowledge, none of the moral theologians list the smoking of a cigarette as a sin.

It is not the gravity of the act of smoking that interests me at the moment, but the parallel between the critics of women smokers and the critics of the modern Catholic novel. The two groups are not at all the same. A critic of the novel may be a heavy smoker; and a critic of the smoker may be most liberally indulgent towards Catholic novelists and their freedom. But a fundamental similarity exists. Some are shocked by women smokers and some are shocked by women novelists. And those who are shocked assume that they are not only more moral-minded but are the only upholders of virtue in the debacle of modernism and indecency. Is shockableness a synonym of sanctity? Is squeamishness another word for morality? Is a rigorist a better moral judge because he is rigorous? The sincere Prohibitionist scorns and despises the weak, sinful man who enjoys sipping a glass of beer with his dinner. But is the Prohibitionist the only zealous apostle in the crusade against gluttony?

As the Prohibitionists are not the only best Catholics in the United States, so the rigorist critics of Catholic novels are not the only undefiled moralists. The literary Prohibitionists would rule out of the novel everything that gives the novel the same qualities that alcohol gives to beers and light wines. To be more precise, references to the weaknesses of flesh are evil to their minds, as alcohol is judged an evil in itself by Prohibitionists. A description of a character who gets entangled in the modern problems of life is as objectionable to them as a bibbler in a saloon is to an earnest Volsteadian. The birth of a

child in a novel is deplored as sadly as a third or fourth child in a poor family is deprecated by the Birth Control League. And all of these things may in themselves be as innocent as the smoking of a cigarette.

Such attitudes are basic to the outcries against Catholic novels which I mentioned in previous articles. One writes: "*That* is not the proper pabulum for the minds of our young people." Another argues: "What is the need of bringing in the lower things of life when there are such sublime things about which to write?" A third exclaims: "Let us uphold virtue and morality as our cherished ideal." With all of which I can agree. But I could likewise agree with the Volsteadian who pleads: "Let us all strive to banish drunkenness from our nation." But I would profoundly differ from him in the interpretation of principle and the application of methods.

The novel is a transfer of the lives of men and women into print and paper, and these lives are mixtures of good and evil, and these mixtures form into tragedies and melodramas and comedies and canonization ceremonies. It would be most edifying if novelists dealt only with such heroes and heroines as were worthy of canonization. But it might be most chastening if they told the story of a tragedy of a broken life. It is not the theme of a novel that is the most important element. It is the attitude which the novelist takes towards the theme, and consequent on that, the manner in which he exposes the theme.

No sane judge of morality in the novel has ever laid down the general principle that sin must be prohibited from works of fiction. Detective stories revolve around violations of the Ten Commandments. Quite legitimately, and without offense, the writer of mystery yarns is allowed to make murder, suicide, theft, the subject matter of his story. There is no dispute on the legitimacy of the use of violations of eight commandments as fiction-material.

Most freely may it be admitted that the two other commandments are in a category by themselves. Not all people are prone to murder and thief, but no normal human being is proof against the weakness of primal instincts. Temptations to the latter are far more frequent and more alluring than are inducements to commit sins of atheism or disobedience or robbery or assassination. Despite these and other grave considerations, should one establish it as a fundamental rule that sex, passion, infidelity and allied sins and frailties must be wholly prohibited from the pages of a Catholic novel? It is my opinion that the novelist is free to make such material the theme of his story. The contrary opinion is basic to the criticisms recently made by those who profess to uphold the standard of a higher Catholicism.

According to this school of commentators, the mention of such evil is an evil in itself. Any references to it must be banned, if the novel is to be approved as safe for modern Catholic readers. But such material has been the staple of fictional literature long before the novel was invented, and it has been the dominant element in novels that are recognized as classics. Love, passion and the sins that result are an integral part of the drama of life. As such, they are the legitimate materials for the novelist.

Immediately, however, to this first principle that all life is open to the novelist, must be added a second principle that would limit and restrict. Because a doctor has the privilege and even the necessity of prescribing medicine, he is not thereby empowered to infect his patients with harmful drugs. Or because a man has a license to carry firearms, he is not at liberty to use his gunpowder indiscriminately. He must be guided by reason and morality and ethics, he must observe the laws of God and man. And so in the novel. The writer has a responsibility in his profession. Granted that he has freedom in the choice of his material, he has a most grave duty of handling this material in the proper way. In brief, his attitude towards his material is far more important than is the theme and subject-matter.

In the pulpit, the preacher may mention the various forms of sex sin by name and in detail. But he speaks about them to show their malice. He condemns them for what they are and he warns against them as evil things. The novelist in his own sphere is a preacher. The modern, naturalistic, animalistic novelist writes of sin as if it were a virtue. He uses human instinct in much the same way that an anarchist uses dynamite to blow up the king and queen in the royal palace. He peddles pornography as a drug vendor sells his wares to children coming out of the schoolhouse. Other modern novelists of the esthetic school are almost equally poisonous because they take the attitude that sin can be regarded as something inevitable, something wholly human and excusable, even something beautiful and noble. They are to be condemned as thoroughly as the others for their misuse of their material. When a novelist introduces sin into his story, he is obliged to portray it as sin if he is true to himself and his art.

Murder is not an act that should be praised, nor is suicide or theft. The influence of the novelist must be ranged against the criminals who commit such sins. It must, likewise, be directed against those who sin in other ways. Though the sinful acts need not be excluded from the novel, they must be clearly depicted as sinful, as frailties and weaknesses, as worthy of condemnation, as dreadful in their consequences as these things are in the real life that every man knows. The use of this sin-laden material by the novelist must be precisely that of the preacher in the pulpit. Not that the novelist need be a preacher; he would fail if he attempted to use the same technique. His attitude towards his material should be the same, his use of his material should attain the same results. He should chasten, and warn, and create solid principles of right and wrong, with the aim of making his readers better. The philosophy of this may be found in the purely natural drama of the Greeks. And the supernatural basis of it comes from the teachings of the Old and the New Testament.

Though the attitude of the novelist may be correct enough to make his story acceptable to Catholic readers, it is necessary that he observe the dictates of a third principle. The novelist's verbal and imaginative and emotional exposition of his material and of his attitude must be governed by decency, by the conventions of his times,

by inherent good taste, by the reticence that is so closely linked to morality.

Biblical language is fit and proper for the Bible. Chaucer and Shakespeare lived in an era when respectable people were not shocked by spade-like words. Even the Scandinavian idiom of today might prove objectionable to American ears. The novelist should not write all the bad words that he knows, and that for many reasons. Nor should he indite, in minute descriptions, all the details of sin of which he may be aware. He can develop his drama without recourse to inflammatory reconstructions of scenes and characters. He can speak of sin with the same high seriousness and with the same reticence that is manifested in the confessional. And with it all, he can make his meaning clear and his drama powerful.

In evaluating a novel, then, such principles as these three must be borne in mind. My opposition to the rigorist school of Catholic critics is in regard to the first principle. They prohibit sin and reference to sin from a Catholic novel. I do not. My opposition to the majority of novels written by non-Catholics is based on the application of the second and third principles, namely, that of preserving the proper attitude towards their material and that of expressing themselves in proper language and with fitting reticence. The failure of contemporary novelists to observe these principles gives the point to the comments by G. C. Heseltine, writing on another page in this issue under the title "Modernity in Literature." The failure of our domestic critics to distinguish between subject matter and the proper use of subject matter in the novel takes away the point from the many letters of protest that they write to this and other periodicals. But they have not failed to exert as stern an influence on our Catholic novelists as the diners at the luncheon exerted to cramp the freedom of the smoker.

REVIEWS

The Man Charles Dickens: A Victorian Portrait. By EDWARD WAGENKNECHT. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. \$4.00.

It would require nothing more than a hammer and a couple of hours to reduce the David of Michelangelo to a heap of dust. With a pint of pigment one could ruin the Sistine Madonna in a minute. There is today a whole school of "hammer-and-pigment" biographers. Thus the refined vandalism of, say, Mr. Lytton Strachey, can make four "Eminent Victorians" seem perfectly ridiculous in the course of one short book. A few pictures deftly drawn at the critical moments, and the idols begin to crumble. Gordon with an open Bible and an empty bottle; Florence Nightingale worrying over a work on Metaphysics; the old man Arnold dithering away on his death bed; Newman weeping over the gate at Littlemore (in order to cast a shadow on Manning). Mr. Wagenknecht approaches another eminent Victorian in quite another spirit. He understands perfectly that Dickens has feet of clay. He makes this very clear. But there is no daubing for the sake of daubing; no iconoclasm for the mere joy of reducing a man's memory to dust. For this healthy reaction against a morbid tendency we are heartily grateful. Whether, though, the method of "psychography" which is here adopted is an improvement on normal biography is another matter. A miniature literary vignette is one thing; a picture on the large canvas of three hundred pages is another. At least as applied to the larger canvas the method is not altogether convincing. A soul is a principle of life; life is interesting by reason of developments; development takes place in time. Chronology, therefore, may not be so recklessly thrown to

the winds as this method implies. What is worse, Mr. Wagenknecht, in insisting on the sole importance of the inner life, seems at times to identify this with feeling. "Psychography concerns itself wholly with the inner life—with essential attitudes, with secret motives, in short, with the mystery of personality." Well and good. But the author continues: "Whether the subject wrecked a social order as did Voltaire, or whether he merely translated a few poems as did Edward Fitzgerald, makes essentially no difference. What the psychographer is primarily interested in, is *how he felt* while he was doing it." In quite a different context Mr. Wagenknecht writes: "But true religion, after all, is much more a matter of feeling than a matter of thinking." In this book the indefinite tendencies of contemporary criticism are frequently assailed, and rightly so. But a thoughtful person will ask whether the roots of the current chaos are not to be found in this Evangelical emphasis on religious emotion. Perhaps it was a dim awareness of this truth that led the author to cloud the clarity of his principle by the confusion of thought which immediately follows: "... and much more significant for my purpose in this book than any specific formulation on Dickens' part of his *religious opinions* are those little casual touches in his life and work which show how thoroughly religion was a part of his being and how inseparable it was from his conception of life." Surely a conception of life which is inseparable from religion depends more on a "matter of thinking" than on a "matter of feeling." With these reservations, however, this is a book which may be recommended.

G. G. W.

The Healthy Mind: Mental Hygiene for Adults. Edited by HENRY B. ELKIND. New York: Greenberg. \$3.50.

It is an encouraging sign to find prominent psychiatrists with sufficient courage to avow openly that there is still such a thing as a normal, healthy mind; and with such a full store of practical common sense as is shown in these authoritative applications of psychiatry to everyday life in terms that the ordinary man can understand and digest. In a collection of this kind, however, there can be no more question of unqualified approval of every contributor's utterances than there can be a hope of full acceptance of every selection in an anthology of poetry or short stories. Nothing like a systematic treatment of the subject of mental hygiene is attempted in these pages, but they do attempt an informal discussion of some important issues of adult life. Dr. James J. Walsh, with his usual good humor, common sense, and vision answers the question, "Do We Americans Live?" Dr. Abraham Myerson makes an important distinction between normal and abnormal fear. "The emotion of fear," he states, "is one of the most insulted of the emotions at the present time." He shows with clear illustrations that this emotion may not be the deplorable, devastating and ignoble thing which some of our charlatans would make of it. Many of our pseudo-psychologists have attempted to discredit the emotions of fear and shame and their efforts may be responsible for a generation of youth that has caused no little alarm and concern, and for a prevalence of crime which has become a reason for national disquiet. It is time, then, that men with some authority gave expression to sane and normal views on these matters. Dr. Joseph Jastrow contributes a general message on "Keeping Mentally Fit," Esther Loring Richards explains the meaning of "Nerves" in our lives, Karl M. Bowman writes about "Fatigue, Worry and the Blues," and Douglas Thom reminds parents that "The Child is Father of the Man." One sees in this volume a return to healthier discussion and a saner outlook with proper perspective on the things of life.

J. T. M.

Travel Talk. By MARGARET A. O'REILEY. Boston: Meador Publishing Company. \$3.50.

In the form of letters to friends Mrs. O'Reiley has set down in leisurely and informal conversational style her impressions during a tour of five European countries. She writes of street life in Naples, of Christmas in Rome, of His Holiness Pius XI, of Mussolini. She describes winter on the Riviera, the carnival of Venice, Venice and its water-ways. There are many useful and interesting bits of information for prospective travelers, many

delightful reminiscences for those who have already toured Europe, and entertaining reading for those who wish to know about the lives of the people of other lands from one who has lived for some years with these people and who is qualified by training and sympathy to appreciate and understandingly convey to others her personal experiences and impressions of people, places, and things in general. The style of these letters and the deep spirit of reverence and devotion which animates them are an evidence of the author's literary and spiritual training. If at times a friendly familiarity with the liturgy, as extended in some of the European churches, is noted, one must remember that the author has been for many years organist and choir director. Her knowledge of music is evidenced in many little snatches of songs, which are here transcribed for the reader and which give some impression of the writer's reactions to various experiences. For instance, in gay mood, there is eloquent expression in the notes which close the volume with the joyful realization that "there is no place like home." The chapters on Rambles in Rome and on Ste. Jeanne d'Arc might be set out for special mention, but it is difficult to make a selection where all the letters are marked with interest. The book is profusely illustrated with forty pictures, eight in three colors, and eleven pieces of music. There are 413 pages in small print, but if they are read in the same leisurely style in which the author has written, they shall appear all too few for Catholic readers who enjoy travel talks.

J. J. B.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Preserving the Records.—The leading article in the *Catholic Historical Review* for January is on the "Earliest Settlements of the Illinois Country" by the Rev. Gilbert J. Garraghan, S. J. Other papers are: "What Is Meant by Catholic Emancipation," by the Rev. Myles V. Ronen; "Cardinal Pole and the Problem of Christian Unity," by the Rev. Gerald G. Walsh, S. J.; and "An Unpublished Document on the Great Interdict," by the Rev. George Lacombe. There are besides critical reviews of thirty-one recently published historical works and seventeen pages of brief historical notes. The *Review* is the official organ of the American Historical Association, which has just completed the first decade of its service in the advancement of historical science. It announces a proposed annual volume devoted to source-material, the first issue of which will be "The Diplomatic Correspondence Between the United States and the Vatican," edited by Dr. Leo F. Stock.

The Rev. Dr. Paul J. Foik, C.S.C., of St. Edward's University, Austin, Texas, has been working assiduously for years on a history of the American Catholic press, and has collected a wealth of the details concerning its development and personnel which he intends to publish in two volumes. He has given the manuscript of the first volume "Pioneer Catholic Journalism," which embraces the record up to 1841, to the United States Catholic Historical Society of New York, to be published as one of that society's Monographs. It is expected that it will be ready for circulation in April next. It will make a book of some 300 pages.

History of Spanish America.—Jean Toussaint Bertrand, one of that group of Parisian scholars for whom America has a history and an archeology as well as an imperial dream, has written two fascinating volumes: "Histoire de l'Amérique espagnole" (Paris: Editions Spes). Purposing to reduce and synthesize to educational proportions the eight monumental volumes of Carlos Pereyra, he has succeeded in yoking the restive careers of twenty countries into an intelligible course. The invocation of Msgr. Baudrillart, the preface of Professor Belaunde and the author's own words give us clearly to understand that he claims to judge his materials with Catholic and Latin sympathies. One may take a certain perverse satisfaction in noting how closely his conclusions coincide with our own Gaelic and Anglo-Saxon presentiments. Systematically, he marks off five great epochs in his tale. The periods of conquest and civilization appear dominated by the sociological issue: Las Casas, champion of the Indians, makes the fatal compromise of African exploitation, and thereafter the three elements of color control the development of government and religion; with the Religious Orders habitually defending the rights

of the natives, and resisting the regime of peonage and forced labor in the silver mines. The summary at the end of the first volume appraises the Spanish restitution, apart from religion, at an agricultural level. The second volume sets off the 10,000,000 people of Spain against the thirteen millions of Spanish America, and stresses the part which Spanish Liberalism, after the analogy of English Whiggery, played in the eventual revolt. The earlier decadence of Spain has been already examined under the counts of morals, politics and finance; and the proud suspiciousness of the old Spanish orthodoxy, its zealotry against chimeras, yet its perfectly modern knack for gold and for military prodigality, detailed by Spanish witnesses. Bolivar comes inevitably. The fourth age, that of the Revolutions, is covered schematically. In the author's survey of the contemporary period, dismissing the rather fleshless inventory of Spanish-American thought and esthetics, one retains the firm impression that excepting the four "white" countries (Argentina, Chile, Uruguay and Costa-Rica), the fundamental and colossal problems remain sociological and agrarian—despite all the red herrings which have in late years been dragged across the trails.

From French Presses. It needs no clairvoyant scrutiny to discern, of late years, the critique of catechetics among us. England, France, Germany, Switzerland, have been searched for the formula to interiorize and vivify the ancient discipline which recent generations have encountered so monotonously in its apologetic and combative commonplaces. The Vicar General of Versailles, Msgr. Quenard, offers in his "*La Parole de Dieu au Catéchisme*" (Paris: Editions Spes), a concordance of Scriptural texts arranged under the rubrics of the catechism of the archdiocese of Paris. Its virtues are largely the virtues of that catechism, built on the Trinitarian basis of the Apostles' Creed. Msgr. Quenard attempts to render the outline even more concrete by peopling it with Scriptural figures, and illuminating it with the Person of our Lord. It seems, however, that in forbidding himself the richness of Pauline texts he impoverishes the full vitality which has flowed from Christ into the Church as into His mystical fulness; and there still remains a bit of extrinsicism in considering grace and faith under the sole aspects of *means and duty*.

"*Carnet de Préparation d'un Catéchiste*" (Paris: Editions Spes), by Abbé Quinet, who holds rank in the forces of religious instruction in Paris, is the first of three pedagogic volumes intended for catechists. There is here the same solicitude which Msgr. Quenard showed for concrete presentation; but Abbé Quinet points richer perspectives of catechetical religiosity: both in his excellent blackboard technique, and in his sense of the Divine life unfolding in each child elected to baptismal grace. He has confidence in children's docility, in the fresh relish of the explanation of things, in their comprehension of a heavenly Father and His all-enfolding love.

Père Gerest, O.P., has written a theological litany in his "*Sous l'Egide de la Vierge Fidèle*," the third volume of his *Veritas*, a synthesis of Christian life (Paris: Lethielleux). Faith allows one to affirm of the Mother of God all the ideals which theology establishes. Père Gerest chooses the ardor and elan of faith itself, with all its Thomistic attachments to transcendent Reality. One would underline his indictment of that lingering skepticism which is afraid in practice to exalt mystery and to accept the mystic; and one would take particular pains to salute the beautiful chapter on the beatitudes of Mary.

The explanations of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius, and the allied meditations in which aspects of the life of Christ are developed, have long made the name of Father Moritz Meschler familiar. Five years ago, these two works were delivered to the public at large, in the German edition of Walter Sierp, S.J.; and this has now appeared in French, in three volumes, through the services of Abbé Mazoyer (Paris: Lethielleux). This is a "Meschler" of more subtle blend, for the editor has a keen ear for essential accent; and frequently confronts the novice master with Watrigant, the scholar, or presses a tone which is now called "Bérullian," or leaves pause for the easier entrance of the graces of prayer.

The Shepherd of Weepingwold. Brother Anselmo. The Mystery of the Open Window. The Whirlwind. Daughters of the Manor.

Enid Dinnis has a very subtle ability to slip out of the reality of the material world into the reality of a spiritual world, and to draw her reader with her; to slip out of the twentieth century into the fifteenth, and yet leave the illusion that the fifteenth might still be the twentieth century. Her ability is an art, as appealing as it is clever. "The Shepherd of Weepingwold" (Herder, \$2.00), her latest historical excursion, is a delightful story of Tudor England, but not unmindful of present-day England. Brother Kit was the "ewe-lamb" of the monastery, as heavenly-minded and as wise in his simplicity as a Francis of Assisi. Sir Robert Luffkyn (is he a modern industrialist?) forces Kit to become the parish priest of Weepingwold. As Sir Christopher, the "ewe-lamb" engages in several episodes with his sluggish parishioners, with the witch, so-called, with Petronilla, the last of the de Lessels, with Sir Robert and the London sophisticates. An inimitable humor saves these chapters from any dullness, and a fine sense of spiritual values preserves them from being unimportant. This latest story is in the authentic and inimitable Enid Dinnis manner.

Four tales there are in "Brother Anselmo" (Payson and Clark, \$2.50), by Dorothy Glaser. They are short tales, but long enough to make a little book, artistically printed and bound. They are told by an old monk who served as librarian in a Dominican monastery. The first tale relates a story showing that glory in warfare is not a sufficient lure to draw a monk from his monastery. The second tells of ecclesiastical ambition, wherefrom the monk decided not to aspire to become a Prince of the Church. And the third and fourth are moral tales of missionaries and lovers. It may be that Dorothy Glaser is not a Catholic, but she tries to preserve the Catholic spirit as some other authors of the day who treat of Catholic subjects. Thus, quaintly, she relates her fables with artistic elegance and imitative piety.

Is it possible that a man be found murdered in a thoroughly barred room of which he was the sole occupant? This is the question Anthony Gilbert answers in "The Mystery of the Open Window" (Dodd, Mead, \$2.00). According to the evidence Sir Hector Ascher enters a room alive; no one else enters the room after the living Sir Hector bars every mode of ingress; yet, according to the evidence Sir Hector was stabbed to death during the night. Evidently something is wrong with the evidence. The reader will naturally deduce the existence of a murderer hiding under a bed or lurking in a closet. This will only serve to increase the mystery. It is not the key to the solution. Who, then, killed Sir Hector Ascher? The answer can be found in Mr. Gilbert's interesting book which gives the mystery story fans a home assignment in the pleasant game of guessing.

An historical novel should paint historical characters with sufficient accuracy. It should be, as a rule, a series of pen pictures enlivened by sprightly romance. "The Whirlwind" (Macmillan, \$2.50), by William Stearns Davis, is an historical novel, interesting and attractive, it is true, but hardly up to the standard set by the leaders in this kind of literature. It presents a striking description of the French Revolution up to the fall of Robespierre. The historical characters are in the main true to life, but the author may not be forgiven, when he makes Marie Antoinette little better than a criminal. There are bounds which even the novelist may not pass. The style is at times flippant and the romance entirely too secondary.

In Mary Dodge Ten Eyck's "Daughters of the Manor" (Benziger, \$1.25), the daughters are five active girls and the manor is a convent boarding school on the Hudson. This "Big Five" manages to liven up the dullness of ordinary school discipline by plotting and executing escapades. Miss Ten Eyck knows the healthy-bodied and healthy-minded young Catholic boarding-school girl and she draws an attractive picture of what goes on behind convent walls. Feminine readers of high-school age, or just under, will devour this story as the "Big Five" eats chocolates and bonbons, and these readers will seek more of Miss Ten Eyck's works.

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

Could This Be Lieutenant Scammon?

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In reply to the request of George F. O'Dwyer, in the issue of AMERICA for January 18, for information concerning a Lieutenant Scammon, I would submit the following sketch from the "History of the Catholic Church in New Jersey" (Flynn, 1904, pp. 618-19):

Gen. Ellakim Parker Scammon who died in New York City, was for a number of years professor of mathematics at Seton Hall College, South Orange, N. J. He was born December 27, 1816, at Whitefield, Me., graduating from West Point in 1837, fifth in a class of fifty-two, and was afterward appointed tutor of mathematics in that institution, having as his pupils Generals Grant, Rosecrans and Newton, and was a roommate of General Bragg. He took an active part in the Seminole War and served on astronomical work at Oswego in 1840 and also in the States of Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota and Dakota.

In 1846-7 he was aide to General Scott in the Mexican War, and was recommended for promotion at the battle of Vera Cruz.

He had the happiness of making his first Communion August 9, 1846, in St. Peter's Church, New York. From 1847 to 1854 he was engaged in a survey of the Upper Lakes and in 1856 resigned from the army and for a time lived in Virginia. He subsequently became professor of mathematics at St. Mary's College, Cincinnati, O., and later director and professor of the Polytechnic College of that city.

In 1875 he accepted the chair of mathematics in Seton Hall, which he held until 1882.

He led an active life until 1893, when he was stricken with the fatal disease which caused his death December 7, 1894.

Query: Could it be that the subject of the sketch just quoted is the Lieutenant Scammon concerning whom Mr. O'Dwyer is making inquiry?

Orange, N. J.

(REV.) PAUL T. CAREW.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Heitman's Historical Register, which gives the records of all commissioned officers who have served in the regular army of the United States from the date of its organization to the year 1903, shows that there have been three officers named Scammon. One served during the War of 1812 and resigned in 1814. Another served during the Civil War period only. A third, Eliakam Parker Scammon, is probably the Lieutenant Scammon referred to in the communication of Mr. O'Dwyer in your last issue.

This officer was born in Maine. He was appointed to West Point from that State on July 1, 1833. On his graduation, he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Fourth Artillery as of July 1, 1837. A year later he was transferred with the same rank to the newly organized Topographical Engineers, with which branch he continued to serve until he was dismissed from the army June 4, 1856. Meanwhile he became a first lieutenant on September 1, 1846 and a captain on March 3, 1853.

The record does not set forth the cause of dismissal. It is probable, however, that it was not because of any moral turpitude because, during the Civil War, he served as a Colonel of the Third Ohio Volunteers' Infantry from June 27, 1861, to October 15, 1862. On this latter date, he became a Brigadier General of the Volunteers and served in this rank to the end of the war, having been mustered out on August 24, 1865. He died December 7, 1894.

If this officer was the Lieutenant Scammon who was stationed in the Springfield Arsenal in the late forties (referred to in the letter of Mr. O'Dwyer) it is probable that he was a convert to the Faith. His name would seem to indicate that he was not a Catholic by birth.

Boston.

JOHN D. DRUM.

"All in a Day's Work"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I was sorry to see that there was no happy climax in the Scrooge type of Christmas Carol that appeared in the issue of AMERICA for November 30 under the title "All in a Day's Work."

In listing some of the "request" mail he received, the author was a little painful by his ignorant emphasis on the phrase, "Only \$1.00 for the lot." When so many commercial houses send out the same number for the same price, but with the meaningless impressions of a pine-tree covered with snow, a lit-up inn, and burning candles, why should not our Catholic institutions spread the true Christmas spirit with cards that show the crib, the Virgin with Child, and lovable St. Joseph? There are no pine trees in Bethlehem; the lit-up inn reminds me of the places that drove the expectant Mother to the stable; and camels belong to January 6! The only thing camels recall to some is a pack of cigarettes. . . .

Scranton, Pa.

LEO. J. WASHILA.

[Dr. Muttowski placed no "ignorant emphasis" on the price. He did call attention to the fact that merchandise not ordered had been sent to him and to others with a request for payment for the same, a method of marketing of which he disapproved.—Ed. AMERICA.]

Asks Aid for an Austrian Convent

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In the little village of Hall, Austria, there is a convent of cloistered nuns, the Daughters of the Sacred Heart, who offer reparation to the Sacred Heart for the sins of mankind, especially for the indifference and carelessness of priests. They carry out this purpose by adoration of our Blessed Lord in the Sacrament of the Altar.

Of late the community is incapable of perpetual adoration, because too many have been afflicted with the dreaded white plague, or have been otherwise incapacitated by lack of proper recreation. The trouble is that they have had no garden where they might seek a few minutes' respite during their arduous day. For seventeen years they have depended on the generosity of a neighbor, using his garden for a half-hour daily. Even this could not always be, for they are strictly cloistered, and so had to avoid all intrusions and especially the curiosity of sightseers.

You can imagine the effect upon the health of the community. In two years they lost four Sisters by tuberculosis. Things came to such a pass that the Superior of the Order told them either to buy an adjacent piece of land or permanently close the convent.

Unwilling to leave a church renowned by the visits of St. Peter Canisius and hallowed by the interment of the holy Magdalen of the Hapsburgs, they resolved to purchase the ground in question.

And now the difficulty. The mayor of the village, a man with communistic leanings, somehow learned of their predicament. He owned the property they needed, and so the price tripled itself when the request of purchase was made.

What could the poor Sisters do? Faced with the alternative of voluntary retirement or of meeting his exorbitant demands, they chose the latter, so as to preserve their unity and to profess their confidence in Our Lord's unbounded goodness.

But the question remains: how can they meet these demands? Of themselves they cannot hope to do so, though the debt, judged by American standards, is but trifling—a matter of some \$3,000. They have to depend on their handwork (making religious articles) and their begging to secure a livelihood. Neither of these means succeeds very well in impoverished Austria.

Perhaps some of the alumni of the Canisianum or other generous souls can come to their assistance. Thank you for what publicity you can give to this appeal, and be assured of the Sisters' prayers.

Canisianum

(REV.) A. FURST.

Innsbruck, Austria.

[Donations for this cause may be sent to the America Press Charities Fund, in care of the Editor of AMERICA, 329 W. 108th Street, New York City.—Ed. AMERICA.]